

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Dean of Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio

In Collaboration with JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago

Volume VI

OCTOBER, 1922

Numbers 3-4

RECENT HISTORICAL MATERIAL ON ASHURBANIPAL

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago

SINCE Streck studied the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal and his successors in the *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, additional material has been published — or republished — in vol. 34 and 35 of the *Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum*. We shall in this article take up some of this new material.

I. CT 35, 48 (K 1364) (Streck, II, 174-175) was partly known to us through G. Smith's *History of Assurbanipal*, 243-244, where a good deal of the reverse was given. The whole text reads now as follows,

Obv. ¹...²...he caused to take...³...their glorious emblems... filled...⁴...grandson of Sennacherib, I am indeed...⁵...their... I conquered my enemies. I was satisfied in the plenitude of my heart. ⁶...the place of the feet...he cut off the head of Teumman their king in the presence of his soldiers. ⁷...on his throne. Ummanigash son of Urtaki, king of Elam who had fled and taken hold of my feet. ⁸Tammaritu, third brother of Ummanigash, I established as king in Hidalu. ⁹Ummanigash, the creature of my hands [forgot] the good...¹⁰...before Shamash-shum-ukin...¹¹...he accepted a bribe and sent [to help him]. ¹²...my troops which marched through Karduniash...¹³...their...they went up and ¹⁴...-tu-la, brother of Ummanigash against Um-[manigash(?)] ¹⁵...

Rev. ¹Tammaritu who after Ummanigash had sat upon [the throne of Elam]...²did [not] enquire after [my royal] welfare...³I prayed

orisons to Bel and Nabu...⁴Indabigash his servant rebelled against him and accomplished his defeat...⁵Tammaritu, his brothers, his family, his father's kin and the princes walking [at his sides] ⁶fled before Indabigash his servant and seized my royal feet. My messenger ⁷concerning the going of Nana from the midst of Susa to Uruk I sent to [Elam] ⁸to Ummanaldasi king of Elam and he did not [hearken to me(?)] ⁹For the third time, by the command of Nabu, son of the king of the gods, the glorious one, who is clothed with brilliancy, [I went] to [Elam] ¹⁰Fourteen fortified cities, royal seats with numberless smaller cities ¹¹and twelve districts in the midst of the whole of Elam, I conquered, ravaged, destroyed, [burned with fire] ¹²their gods, their goddesses, their goods and possessions, people, male and female, horses, mules ¹³asses, cattle and sheep, more numerous than locusts ¹⁴...Nana Lady of Eanna...

2. CT 35, 36 (K 2637, Cf. 3 Rawl. 37a 67-78 and G. Smith, *Assurbanipal*, p. 148). There is nothing to add to the text as given by Streck, II, 320-323.

3. CT 35, 13-15 is a very difficult text. Bezold, Catalog. IV, 1644, had given five lines of it and they had been translated and transliterated by Streck, II, p. 342-343. In his *Tamuz and Ishtar*, p. 146-147, Langdon translated a few sections. We give first a transliteration of the text.

¹...la na... ṭabtu(?) -ka ²ku-u-lu a-aš(?) -šu ...ma tu-da-na(?) -aḥ(?) -[ḥa]-az-šu ³...e(?) -peš pi-ia e-mid li...⁴a-nun-na-ki u-ḫa-'-u a-na ši-kin ṭe-me-šu ⁴...šarrani^{pl} a-šib pa-rak-ki [ana pani]-ka it-ta-nak-me-su u-na-aš-ši-ḫu šepâ^{du} -ka ⁵[^{is}kasatê]^{pl} ^{mat}elamti^{ki} u-[šab]-bir-ma ^{is}kašta-ka u-dan-nin ⁶[ina eli] kul-lat ^{am}nakirê^{pl} -[ka] u-šar-ba-a ^{is}kakkê^{pl} -ka ⁷...iš-du-DU(kin) šar bab-iliki a-lik maḥ-ri-su a-šim-šu-ma ⁸[ina t]jir-ši-šu nišê-šu [su]-un-ḫu lu-tu ik-su-su ku-ru-us-si ⁹[bu-bu]-tu [hu-sa-hu(?)] nišê ^{mat}akkadi^{ki} u-ša-aš-bit-ma ¹⁰[a]-kil-šu-nu-ti šīru a-ḥa-meš ¹¹...¹⁹...ilu-ti-ia ...ma ²⁰[lu(?)] -šap-ši-iḥ... [t]i-ia ²¹[uš]-zi-zu bab-šu... a-ši(?) ... ḫa-tu-u-a ²²[ina(?)] a-mat ilu-ti-ia aḫ-bi-ka-ma at-ta te-e-pu-uš ²³[u]d-du-uš ilâni^{pl} ša-a-tu-[nu...] eš-ri-e-ti-šu-nu ap-kid-ka ka-tuk-ka ²⁴ina puḫri-šu-nu iš-mu-u ik-tarra-bu šarru-ut-ka ²⁵[i-na] umê (text šabê)^{pl} -ka ma-'-dis iḫ-bu-u [i]na maḥ-ri-ia ²⁶...^{am}nakirê^{pl} ša ilu-ti rabûti...i-pal-la-ḫu ²⁷ki-i

pi-i an-nim-ma a-na šu... (perh. *ḫati-ka*) a-man-nu ²⁸dup-pi bu-us-su-rat ḫa-di-e [su]-lum-me-e ²⁹tu-še-bi-la [ina(?)] pani(?) ilu]-ti-ia ³⁰u-rad(?) -di ib-bi-šu(?)...

Rev. ¹ina tukulti-ia rabu-ti ša u-tak-kil... ²ša it-ti-ka iš-ša-ana... ³šu-ut ip-še-e-te an-na-a-te lim-ni-a-te...-na e-pu-šu eli-ka ⁴iš-di ^{is}kussi šarru-ti-šu as-suḫ pali-šu...sa-paḫ ^{mat}akkadi^{ki} epuša ⁵šuk-lul eš-ri-e-ti ilâni^{pl} rabûti^{pl} ut(?)... na-ki-e ^{immer}niḫê^{pl} ⁶pa-liḫ ilu-ti-a palû damiḫtu bušu(?) ...a-ši-im ši-mat-ka ^{7m. d. is}šamaš-šum-ukîn ša adi-ia la is-su-ru-u-ma ⁸iḫ-tu-u ina ṭabti ^{m. d}assur-ban-apli šarri na-r[a-am] lib-bi-ia ⁹ina me-si-ri dan-ni e-si-ir-šu-ma ar-ku-us ZI (napšat)...^{pl}...-ti ¹⁰...^{am}rabuti^{pl}-šu šir-ri-e-ti aš-kun-ma a-na [šepa^{du}-ka u-ša-aš-ki-nu-šu-nu-]ti ¹¹a-na kit-ri šarrâni^{pl} sa-kap ^{am}nakirê-šu šu- bil(?)...¹²ri-'u-ti mi-ša-ri ba-'u mât ^den-lil ap(?)... ¹³...-lu-ki na-piṣ-ti-šu u sa-paḫ ^{mat}akkadî a-ma-te...ša(?)... ^{14m. d. is}šamaš-šum-ukîn ni-si-ir-te belu-ti-ia ša a-ru-ru-uš-[šu]... ¹⁵...damḫu(?) ša balaṭ napiṣti-šu ul iš-du-du(?)...¹⁶...ilâni^{pl}(?)... kali-šu-nu id-ki-e-ma ¹⁷...e-pu-uš ip-šit limuttim(tim) ša la(?) ṭa-ba-at(?) ¹⁸[mut(?)]-ta-bil makkûrê ilâni^{pl} ¹⁹...ši-mat-su a-na limuttim(tim) ²⁰...e-te-ne-ip-p[u-šu] ²¹[ina g]a-tu-u-a ilâni^{pl}-šu it-ti-šu iz-nu-u u-maš-ši-ru-šu [iṣ]-ba-tu a-ḫa-a-ti ²²[ina] ki-bit ilu-ti-ia rabi-ti alâni^{pl}-šu-nu tak-šu-ud ²³[šal]-lat-su-nu ka-bit-tu ta-aš-lu-la a-na ki-rib ^{mat}aššur^{ki} ²⁴ina tukulti-(ti)-ia rabi-ti ša mun-ṭaḫ-ši-e-šu abikta-šu-nu taš-kun [si-i]t-tu-ti bal-ṭu-su-un ina ḫâtê^{du}.ia... ²⁵ki-rib ninua^{ki} al belu-u-ti-ka ina[kakkê]^{pl} ta-nir-šu-nu-ti ²⁶ina kakkê^{pl}.ia iz-zu-u-ti a-na ka-šad ^{am}nakirê^{pl}-ka [panu]-uk-ka un-da-'ir ²⁷ina zi-kir šumi-ka ša u-šar-bu-u ummânâte-ka a-na(?) [mit]-ḫu-ši kakki it-tal-la-ku šal-ṭa-niṣ ²⁸ina su-up-pi-e ut-nin-ni-ka da(?)...al-lu-u rabi-tu ilu-ti ²⁹i-da-a-ka az-zi-iz-ma i(?)...[g]a-ri-e-ka ³⁰...mârê^{pl} ^{mat}aššur^{ki} ...³¹su-ma ³²šarru-ti-šu.

Translation. ¹...thy favor...²...³... to do my will I imposed... the Anunnaki are intent upon executing his purpose ⁴the kings who dwell in the sacred places shall prostrate themselves [before] thee and kiss thy feet ⁵I shall break [the bows] of Elam, I shall strengthen thy bow ⁶[upon] the totality of [thy] enemies I shall make thy weapons great ⁷...iš-du-du (or -kin) king of Babylon, his predecessor, I have declared for him ⁸[In] his time, his people because of famine and sickness gnawed(?) bones(?) ⁹I caused hun[ger and want] to take hold of the people of Akkad¹⁰...they

ate each other as meat.....¹⁹...my divinity... ²⁰[may he(?)] pacify the heart of my [divinity(?)] ²¹I caused to stand at his gate...my hands ²²By the order of my divinity I command to thee and thou shalt perform it ²³to renovate these gods ...their sanctuaries I have appointed thee (lit. in thy hands) ²⁴In their assemblies they heard they blessed thy kingdom; ²⁵in thy days, they have uttered much in my presence ²⁶...the enemies of the great gods...shall fear ²⁷According to this utterance, I myself will deliver them into thy hand(?) ²⁸A tablet of good news of joy thou shalt carry away ²⁹thou shalt bring before my divine face ³⁰.....

Rev.¹ 1) By my great help, whereby I encouraged...²that are with thee, he shall report...³because of these evil deeds...he has done to thee⁴ I shall tear off the foundation of his royal throne ...his reign...the destruction of Akkad he(?) has made⁵ 2) The completion of the sanctuaries of the great gods ...offering the sacrifices ⁶(thou) who fearest my divinity, a pleasant reign, riches... I appoint as thy fate⁷ 3) Shamashshumikin who kept not my covenant⁸ and sinned against the grace of Ashurbanipal, the king beloved of my heart⁹ I shall enclose him with a mighty blockade, I will tie up the life(?)...¹⁰...of his nobles I shall place cords and I shall make them do obeisance at thy feet ¹¹To the rescue of the kings, overthrow of his enemies bring(?)... ¹²a shepherding of righteousness they are seeking, the land of Enlil....¹³...his life and the overthrow of Akkad...¹⁴Shamashshumukin the treasures of my lordship about which I cursed [him]...¹⁵...the favor of saving the life of his soul he did not draw...¹⁶...the gods...all of them he mustered ¹⁷...he did these evil deeds which are not good¹⁸ removing the treasures of the gods¹⁹ ...his fate for evil²⁰... they did ²¹By my hands his gods were angry with him, they abandoned him, they seized distant parts. ²²[By] the command of my great divinity, thou shalt conquer his cities, thou shalt take away a heavy booty from him into Assyria. ²⁴By my great help thou shalt perform the defeat of his warriors. The rest alive, in my hands... ²⁵In the midst of Nineveh, the city of my dominion, thou shalt kill them with [weapons]. ²⁶12) With my mighty weapons I sent before thee to conquer thy enemies [before] thee. ²⁷13) At

the mention of thy name which I have made great, thy warriors shall march triumphantly to the conflict of arms. ²⁸14) By the orisons that thou hast prayed... great divinity ²⁹I shall stand at thy side...thy enemies³⁰...the sons of Ashur ³¹...³²...kingdom.

This new text made quite clear that in the mind of the priest who inspired these oracles, Shamashshumukin had committed an unforgivable sin, when, in order to buy foreign support, he had spoiled the treasures of the Babylonian temples. He is now abandoned by the gods, largely through the influence of Ishtar, always faithful to the pious Ashurbanipal. His fate is quite certain, as the oracles make clear by using, as Langdon had already remarked, the prophetic perfect.

4. CT 35, 9—12, is not a new text. Streck gave a good translation of the text already edited by G. Smith and S. A. Smith. The new text allows us to read correctly a doubtful passage (CT 35, 10, 22 ff. = Streck, II p. 328).

²² a-na-ku Ashurbanaplu šar Assur ki-rib ²¹mil-ki-a ²³niḫê^{pl} taš-r[i-ih-ti] ak-ki epuš(uš) i-sin-ni ²⁴še-ri

²²I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria in the city of Milkia
²³I offered great sacrifices and performed the festival of Sheri.

5. CT 35, 15 (Rm 2, 305) is a new text. We understand it as follows,

¹...his lord, his king ³...and the oath of the people of his land
⁵...in the midst of a mountain ⁶...his head, his hands, his feet.
⁷...Tammariu they brought and ⁸...my generals ⁹...Tammariu...
¹⁰...they made an alliance(?)¹¹...

Rev. ¹Urtaki, king of Elam ²...Teumman, king of Elam, ³...
Teumman perished(?) ⁴E... Elam ⁵...governor ⁶...seraglio

6. CT 35, 16 is also a new text, which we translate as follows,
¹Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, suppliant...²...their cities...³...my lord...⁴...king...⁵...caused to dwell...⁶...⁷...divine judge of the gods...⁸Esagila at they love...⁹lordship of Assyria, Sumer and Akkad...¹⁰...received their heavy gifts...¹¹...Adad. The people of Assyria, Sumer and Akkad ¹²...since Ummanmenana had made his weapons rage ¹³...they(?) conquered and carried away their booty. ¹⁴...Esarhaddon(?) king of Assyria, king of the four quarters
.....all the kings that are not equalled ...¹⁶...upper and lower

to have dominion in the Orient ¹⁷...of his sceptre like...upon the people...¹⁸...all the totality, charging all the people...¹⁹...his gods, their tribute...

7. CT 35, 17—18 (Rm 40) is a new text with the exception of two lines.

¹I am Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, who by the command of the great gods attained ²the desire of his heart. The clothes, treasures, all the symbols of royalty of Shamashshumukin, ³the faithless brother (read PAP instead of U), his concubines, his generals, the soldiers of his host, ⁴chariots, wagons, his royal vehicles, horses ⁵to make up the teams of his yoke, all kinds of desirable things for his palace, as many as they were, ⁶people, male and female, small and great, I caused to bring before me.

⁷Nabushallimshunu, chief driver, Manu-ki-Babili, son of Nabu-shalimshunu.

⁸The sons of Eazerikisha, of Bit-Amukkani.

⁹I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria. ¹⁰By the command of Ashur and Beltis, the great lords ¹¹the kings dwelling in sacred places bowed to my yoke ¹²The bows of Tammaritu, king of Elam ¹³in their midst, he made strong to encounter my troops... ¹⁴the festival by the might of Ashur and Ishtar ¹⁵the gods my helpers, the bows of the son of...¹⁶...month Nisan with...

The reverse of the text (Rm 40) was partly known since from Bezold's *Catalogue* p. 1575, Streck had translated two lines (Vol. II, p. 339) The text of the reverse is as follows,

²...ilu-šu ³...ku-nu...ellu(?) ⁴...ina ki-bit-ku-nu šir-ti ⁵...-nu ki-nu ša la ittakkaru(u) ⁶...-ka ^de-a u ^dmarduk ⁷...[šu-n]u-ti-ma li-me-du pu-uz-ra-a-ti ⁸...-ni-ku-nu niš ^dmarduk apli reš-ti-i ⁹ša ^aassur niš ^dninib aplu ašaridu sa ^den-lil niš ^dnergal idlu dan-nu-ti ¹⁰iš-me-šu-nu-ti-ma ma-ruš-[tu] li-is-su-u li-ri-ku ¹¹li-tap-pi-ru lit-tal-ku šiptu ¹²ina pan šalmani^{pl} abkallê^{pl}

Translation. ²...his god ³...your pure(?)... ⁴by your noble command ⁵...your faithful ...which is not altered ⁶...thy...Ea and Marduk ⁷...their...may they establish the mysteries ⁸...your ...by the oath of Marduk the first son ⁹[of] Ashur by the oath of Ninib, the first born of Enlil, by the oath of Nergal the mighty hero ¹⁰he heard them. The calamity let them remove, let them

put away ¹¹let them go away, let them depart. Incantation.

¹²Before the images of the wise.

8. CT 35, 18, K 6049 is a new text.

¹...Tammaritu ²Parû, son of Ummanaldasi ³...without number the soldiers of...⁴...Teumman, king of Elam, his father's brother...⁵...son of his sister that Tirhaka, king of Cush...

9. CT 35, 18 K 6384 is too fragmentary to be translated at present. We read on the edge: ⁴...Birishadri, governor of Matai, Sharati...⁵...75 cities...

(To be continued.)

LITURGICAL ELEMENTS IN BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN SEAL CYLINDERS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

THE term Liturgical Elements has been taken in this article to include all elements on the seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria which may be interpreted as belonging to any part of the ritual of divine service as it was known among the Babylonians and Assyrians. These elements are: The posture of the deities worshipped and of the worshippers, priests and attendants; ritual acts or gestures of the same personages; and their vestments. Almost always the service depicted on these seals is a sacrificial one, and the liturgical elements of this particular kind of service have been noted. The purpose of this investigation, therefore has been to canvass these seal cylinders for any light their inscriptions may have to throw upon the form and nature of divine service among the Babylonians and Assyrians. The results have not been disappointing, although inconclusive in some respects.

The term early Babylonian has been used to include Sumerian down to and including the Hammurabi Dynasty; Assyrian is selfevident; but late Babylonian has been made to include the Cassite Dynasty.

These seals, as a rule, were dedicated by a servant or handmaid to his or her deity. As a rule, they bear no literary inscriptions. Exceptional are a few on which the name of the worshipper and his deity are given, as well as those of the Cassite period which are mostly occupied with long prayers of invocation, and some late Babylonian seals, which have imprecations.

Most of the literature dealing with the subject of Babylonian and Assyrian seals is to be found in the *Verzeichnis der Abkürzungen* to Weber, *Altorientalische Siegelbilder* (Der alte Orient, 17. und 18. Jahrgang), Leipzig, 1920.¹

¹ The less obvious abbreviations used in this article are: AO = *Der alte Orient*,

In liturgical services some of the most important elements are posture, gesture, and vestments. The seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria testify to this. Whenever a liturgical scene is represented, the deities and priests and attendants are always represented in definite postures with definite gestures, and clad in definite liturgical garments. Deities — gods and goddesses — are represented usually in a standing or a sitting posture. The deity often stands near the altar (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.*, No. 86). He is sometimes represented with his left foot on a mountain (AO 383), or with his right foot on a animal (Delaporte, *Mus. Guim.* Vol. XXXI, p. 211, fig. 11). Ištar stands on dogs (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 101), with her right foot on a lion (Ward PM 91), or with her foot on a stool (Delaporte, *Mus. Guim.*, Vol. XXXI, p. 216, fig. 13). This last posture is also assumed by Šamaš (Qβ 8). A male and female deity are found standing on steps (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 52), Marduk stands on a composite creature (Ward PM 92). Nergal stands with his left hand at his waist (Pinches, BA Cyl. Seals, pl. 1, No. 4), and a deity stands by the side of a sacred tree (Ward WA 663).

More often deities are represented in a sitting posture. Thus, the deity is found sitting on a square throne in a kiosque (Speleers, *Catalogue* No. 590). The throne may have steps (De Clercq *Cy. Or.*, 83), or may be placed beneath a crescent (Qa 29). The goddess Ištar is represented sitting on a bench in the shade of a large tree (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 104), often with a child, representing the protection which she will give to her worshippers (Ward WA, p. 154). Again, she sits on a throne with her feet on a lion (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100; Ward WA 407). Nisaba is enthroned upon a mountain (Qa 22), and another goddess sits on a highbacked throne



Weber, *Altorientalische Siegelbilder*; *Cy. Or. B. N.* = Delaporte, *Catalogue des Cylindres Orientaux . . . de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1910; Pinches BA Cyl. Seals = *Babylonian and Assyrian Seals in the Possession of Sir Henry Peek*, 1890; Qa, Qβ, Qγ, = *Catalogue of the Collection of Antique Art formed by James Ninth Earl of Southesk*. Edited by Lady H. Carnegie, London, 1908; Ward in Curtiss = Ward, "Altars and Sacrifices in the Primitive Art of Babylonia" in S. J. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion Today*, Chicago, 1902; Ward PM = Ward, *Cylinders and Other Ancient Oriental Seals in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, New York, 1909; Ward, WA = *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, Washington, 1910.

(Ward PM 177). In one case a deity sits in a wagon to which is harnessed a dragon (Ward WA 127), and in another a deity is seated in an enclosure (Ward WA 341). The enclosure in Ward WA 399 takes the form of a tent, made by a bent tree. In the tent is found a kneeling goddess, beside whom is a kneeling god. The deity's throne often takes the form of a boat (Ward PM 7), a seamonster in the form of a boat (Ward PM 8), or a swan (Ward PM 145).

Those deities most commonly found standing are: Šamaš, Ai, Ištar, Adad, Marduk, Ramman, Shala, Enlil; and those most usually represented in sitting posture are: Šamaš, Sin, Bau and Ištar.

In Assyrian and late Babylonian times, the presence of a deity at divine service was not considered necessary. His place could be taken by his symbol (Jr. of the British Arch. Ass., Vol. 41, pl. 3, No. 4; Q β 37), and he was often replaced by a mythological divine figure, such as the man-fish (Ward Wa 658), or the sacred tree (Ward WA 670, 695; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 142). The transition period is represented by a scene where both the deity and the sacred tree are present (Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 592). But in early Babylonian art the sacred tree is unknown, except in one instance, where Ai stands on one side and a suppliant on the other of a sacred tree (Ward WA 663).

Before detailing the posture of the priest as represented on the seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria, an attempt must be made to determine whether the personage who leads the suppliant into the presence of the deity is a deity or a priest. Because this personage is very often represented as wearing a horned-head-dress, it has been thought that he is a deity. In fact, it is usually assumed, without argument, that he is a deity (RA 16, 57). Now, aside from the fact that, in all ancient religions, such an office is always performed by a priest, it should be borne in mind that this personage, on the seal cylinders, is never named a god. Nor does such a phrase as *ilam u šedam li-ir-ši*, "a god and a protective genius may he have", ever refer to the personage under consideration. On the contrary, this personage is a priest, or priestess (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73; Ward WA 304). The priest, as a rule, dresses as much like the god as possible, and usually holds his hands in a similar position (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 50;

Qa. 35). The priest very often wears a dress over the left shoulder, but leaving the right shoulder free, just as the Egyptian priest (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 73, 74). When this personage is a female, she is a priestess, dressed, as a rule, like a goddess (Ward PM 102; Ward WA 319). That is, both the priest and priestess, by wearing the dress of a deity, impersonate the deity (Ward WA 32). It is, therefore, a priest, probably the high priest, impersonating Ningišzida, who introduces Gudea into the presence of his god, Ningirsu (Meyer, *Sumerier und Semiten*, pl. VII). The horns of the headdress, worn by the priest, do not prove that the wearer is divine. And, not only the priest, but also the suppliant himself, as well as the priestly attendant, often wears a horned headdress (cf. Speleers, *La Collection des Intailles*, 1920, pl. III, No. 590). In fact, the horned headdress indicates not only deity,¹ but also greatness. This is seen by an examination of lugal, , the word for king, which shows a man, wearing a horned headdress, the horns,  indicating greatness. It is safe to say, therefore, that the personage who appears on our seal cylinders in the rôle of conductor, of the suppliant before his god, is not a deity but a priest, often clad like the deity.

The posture of the priest is always a standing one.² He usually leads, with his right hand, the suppliant by his left hand, and has his left hand raised in adoration before the deity (Menant, *Gly. Or.* fig. 73). Sometimes, however, he stands with both hands raised in adoration, while the suppliant stands between him and the deity with both hands folded below his breast (Ward WA 51 a). Sometimes there are two priests with their hands raised in adoration (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 337). When the scene represents a sacrifice, the priest usually stands, with the left hand in the posture of adoration and the right hand on the altar (Ward WA 405). Sometimes the priest is represented as if he had two faces (Ward PM 60). This is a device to show his dutifulness in keeping

¹ It should also be observed that the deity does not always wear a horned headdress, see, for example, Ward WA 315.

² If the second seated figure, in Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 53, 56, be a priest, this would furnish an exception, but this is questionable.

his gaze concentrated on the deity and worshipper at the same time. Sometimes the priest stands before the deity with folded arms (Q β 9, 29), and sometimes, in late Babylonian times, he raises only the left hand in adoration (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 142). The priestess, especially, in the presence of a goddess, plays the same part as a priest (e.g., Ward PM 52; Ward WA 225, 315).

Almost every liturgical seal cylinder has its worshipper. The worshipper is usually represented in a standing posture, with the right hand raised as high as the face, and the left hand grasped by the priest (Menant, *Gly. Or.* fig. 73). Very often a worshipper has his own special god or goddess (RA 16, 49—50), and sometimes two gods (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 119, 120; cf. RA 16, 51, n. 2). As a rule a female worshipped a female deity (Ward WA 221), although there are many exceptions. Kings and even semi-divine beings were represented as a pālīhu, or devotee of a deity (Dungi, Pinches, *Bab. and Assy. Seals of the Br. Mus.*, No. 5, pl. 1; Gilgamesh, Ward WA 418 a). Sometimes the suppliant appeared before his god with both hands folded at his waist and sometimes with one hand raised and the other at the waist or at the side, and often with both hands raised (Ward PM 177; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 118; *ib.* La Haye, pl. II, No. 9; Ward PM 65; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 51, 110; Q β 23). Very often the worshipper brings a kid (Speleers, *Catalogue*, 610) in his left hand, while his right hand is stretched out holding a vessel (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 61), or raised in adoration (*ib.* 62). In one instance a suppliant presents a tree as a dedication to his deity (Ward WA 94); in another case a vase (Ward WA 399), and still another, a vase and vessel (Menant, *Gly. Or.* fig. 101). Now and then two worshippers appear in the same scene (Delaporte, 79), sometimes a man and his wife (Ward WA 218). The usual offering is a goat or kid, but in one instance the worshipper appears driving a ram (Ward PM 14), and in another instance the offering seem to be berries (Delaporte 241). The suppliant also offers libations which are poured in a vase (Delaporte, 155), or on an altar (Ward WA 215). As a rule the worshipper is represented in a standing posture, but sometimes he appears kneeling (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 52; Q β 41; Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 422).

A figure which has been called "warrior god" is probably the representation of a warrior in the act of adoration (see, for example, Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 225). The warrior-suppliant appears preferably before the warrior-goddess, Ištar (Delaporte, 225, &c. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 85, 99).

In these liturgical scenes the priest was attended by another priest or server. There is no reason to believe that this attendant is a deity (Ward WA 51a; Speleers, *Catalogue*, 562). The attendant is usually dressed like the priest, and had both hands raised in adoration (Ward WA 51a; Qa 33). Sometimes there are two attendant priests, both with objects of offerings or dedication (Ward PM 60, 382). The attendant sometimes presents flowers, with left hand at the waist (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100), sometimes he pours a libation on the altar (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.*, No. 86), or presents cakes (Ward WA 215), or carries a pail in the right hand and the left at the waist (Ward WA 403), or has both hands at the waist (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, No. 62). Sometimes the attendant is a female (Ware WA 214). The attendant priest or priestess acted as a server and brought the necessary *res sacrifici* (e. g. Ward WA 307, 374; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 104). Sometimes he was followed by a dog (Ward WA 407).

Gesture, or ritual acts, ever accompanied liturgical services. In the liturgical scenes under consideration the deity usually has his left hand at his waist, and his right hand extended toward the worshippers as if to welcome them (Menant, *Gly. Or.* fig. 73). Sometimes he is represented as holding a vase in the extended hand as if to receive a libation (Ward PM 86; Ward WA 51a). The god of agriculture holds in his hand ears of corn (Ward WA 374), and the goddess Bau sometimes held flowers in her left hand, while her right hand was raised (Ward WA 214). Marduk often wields a scimitar (Ward PM 92). Another deity holds a staff in his right hand and a rod over his left shoulder (*Fr. of the British Arch. Assoc.*, Vol. 41, pp. 396ff., pl. 1, No. 3), and still another seems to be blowing a trumpet (Delaporte, 51). Sometimes the deity raises his left hand when he has something in his right hand (Ward WA 399). Šamaš often holds his saw (Speleers, *Catalogue*, 592), and sometimes his ring and staff (Qβ 8). Another deity seems to

be partaking of a libation by means of a long tube (Delaporte, 58). Adad often carries his thunderbolt and leads a bull (Ward WA 457); Nergal carries a weapon in his right hand (*Jr. of British Arch. Assoc.*, Vol. 41, pp. 396 ff., pl. I, No. 4), and Ištar has her caduceus, arrows and scimitar (Ward PM 91).

The most common gesture of the priest is the raised left hand with thumb and fingers extended (Q β 37; Qa 32). Sometimes he has both hands raised (Ward PM 62); but occasionally he stands with hands folded at the waist (Ward WA 51a; Ward PM 51). The ritual of genuflection was quite common in all periods of Babylonian and Assyrian liturgical worship. The priest often genuflected before the deity whom he served (Delaporte, 73), his right hand being raised and left stretched out (Legrain, *Catal. Cugnin*, No. 16; cf. Delaporte, 77; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 94, 95, 96, and pl. IV, No. 5; Ward PM 58; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 23). The gesture of the priestess is the same as that of the priest (e. g., Ward WA 407).

The attendant priest ordinarily stood with both hands raised in adoration (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73), although very often he was engaged in bringing in some *res sacrifici* or object for use in the service of adoration (e. g. Ward WA 374, 407, 307, 214; Ward PM 72), or in pouring libations (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.* 86).

Special vestments played an important part in liturgical services in Babylonia and Assyria. Normally the deity wore a horned headdress (Speleers, *Catalogue*, 610, 592; Qa 22), except especially in the age of Gudea when he wore a very plain, low turban (Ward WA 303a; cf. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73; Qa 23). Goddesses, ordinarily, also wore the the horned headdress (Ward PM 52, 90). The robe of the deity was usually long and flounced (Qa 22) or pleated (Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 592). The material of the robe may have been linen (Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 610), or goat-skin (Qa 16). The warrior god, Ramman, wore a round turban and short garment (Ward WA pp. 176 ff.). His garment was sometimes a lion's skin with paws (Ward WA 387). In one case, the deity seems to be clothed in a fish-skin (Ward WA 687). The deity is represented with long hair and beard (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 381) and shaven upper lip (Qa 16).

The priest was ordinarily vested like the deity, with horned headdress (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.*, No. 86; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100; Ward PM 51, 52; Qa 22) and long flounced (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73) or pleated robe (Qa 22). His robe was sometimes of a plain variety (Qβ 37). The robe usually goes over the left shoulder and under the right arm (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 73, 100). This robe has been described as the Greek *καυνάκης*, a garment of thick cloth. The priest, like the deity, is sometimes represented clad in a fishskin (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 37) or in an animal's skin (*ib.* 42). Priestesses were similarly clad (e. g., Ward WA 315). The priest was often clean-shaven, head and face (e. g., Qβ 18), sometimes with a long pig-tail of hair (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100), but frequently we find him bearded (Qa 22; Ward WA 374).

As a rule the worshipper appeared bare-headed (Ward PM 51, 62; Qa 22), although there seems to have been exceptions, for example, in the case of Ward WA 307, where the suppliant wore a horned headdress. But the so-called suppliant here might have been a priest or priest's attendant. In one case a nude worshipper seems to be represented (Ward WA 419), otherwise the suppliant wore a long tightly-fitting robe (Qa 26) with long fringes (Qa 23). Ordinarily the worshipper was represented with his head clean shaven and beardless (Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 573; Qa 23; Ward WA 303a, 407; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 381; Pinches, *Berens Collection*, No. 31). He, however, sometimes appears with long hair (Qa 22; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100) and bearded (Qa 22).

The priest's attendant or server usually appeared with horned headdress and robe like the priest (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100), but sometimes he wore a simple round cap (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.*, No. 86; Lajard, XII, No. 17).

The central service in Babylonia and Assyria was the sacrifice and the central object in sacrificial service was the altar. The earliest altar may have been a light construction of reeds or palm-leaf stems. But before long a more substantial erection must have been used where burning could have taken place (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 117). The earliest form of the altar is that of a square, with or without a step or rear-table, at the top where cakes and other *res sacrifici* were placed (Ward WA 302; Ward PM 53;

Ward WA 376). It was probably made of brick (Ward in Curtiss, No. 4, Ward WA 368). It gradually began to vary from straight upright sides to those of concave (Ward in Curtiss, No. 4), until a regular hourglass altar was used (Ward in Curtiss, No. 5; Ward WA 365). This remained the regular form of the altar down to Assyrian times. In Ward in Curtiss, Nos. 6—15 we see a series of these altars represented with the flame of sacrifice or libation rising from them. The deity usually stands on one side and the priest in horned headdress on the other (see, for example, No. 9). These altars are chiefly for libations, but although the slaying of an animal for sacrifice is never represented, it perhaps should be assumed that the offering of animals was for sacrificial purposes. In one instance the altar appears in the form of a tripod (Ward WA 399), but the altar is to be differentiated from the credence table on which the *res sacrifici* are usually placed (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 52; Ward WA 219; Ward PM 117). The Assyrian altar seems to have been much more substantially built than the early Babylonian altar (e. g. Ward WA 1253; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73; Jeremias, *Alt. Geistk.* Abb. 206), although the small vase-like altar was very common (e. g. Ward WA 1260, 1261, 1259, 745, 746, 753; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 339; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 65) as well as a tall peculiarly shaped altar (Ward PM 148, Ward WA 738). Very often what is called an altar by students of these scenes is merely a credence table (e. g. Ward WA 1254, 1255, 1256, 721, 741; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 340, 342—346; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 66).

In Assyrian as well as in Late Babylonian times it became customary to place on or near the altar the symbol of the deity worshipped (e. g. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 118; Q β 37; Q γ 5; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 544 ff.). An interesting example comes from the Assyrian period. An altar is represented with a fish upon it. The fish appears to be worshipped, of course, as the symbol of Dagon (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 40), and on another seal Dagon is again worshipped, and the priest impersonates him, that is, he appears in the form of Dagon with a high mitre (Menant, *ib.* fig. 36). This is interesting in view of what has been said above about the priest being robed like the god whom he serves.

The central service was the sacrifice. Sacrificial scenes, as a rule, have an altar, and around the altar group the deity or his symbol, the priests, worshippers and attendants. The priest is always the sacrificer. The *res sacrifici* varied considerably, although the most popular article of sacrifice was the goat or kid, and next to that the bull. The goat or kid occurs as a sacrificial animal in all periods of Babylonian and Assyrian religious life (e. g. Qa 26; Ward PM 78; Qß 36, 18; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 62; Ward WA 136). The same is true of the bull (e. g. Ward WA p. 364; Ward WA 734). Other *res sacrifici* were: A lamb (Keiser, *Patesi of the Ur Dynasty*, p. 13), a ram (Ward WA 407, 1233), fish (Ward WA 740, 1255), a swan (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, pl. VII, fig. 3), a deer (Ward WA 733), cakes (Ward WA 718, 726), and in early Babylonia a gazelle is found as material of sacrifice (Ward WA 1269).

Menant in his *Gly. Or.* made the claim that the Babylonian and Assyrian seals give evidence of the practice of human sacrifice. He instances (fig. 94) the scene where there is depicted a man with a vessel in his right hand and a worshipper genuflecting with both arms tied. An attendant stands behind the man. In fig. 95, he sees the same man with hand raised, grasping a weapon to kill the suppliant. And in fig. 96, he sees the same man in the act of killing the suppliant. Compare also figures 92 and 93. But Ward (*American Journal of Archaeology*, 5, 34—43) disputes Menant's claim. As there are no inscriptions dealing with this subject on the seals, and as other Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions do not furnish definite material, the question must be left open for the present. Although it must be said that the practice is not inherently impossible, but rather somewhat probable.

Besides the sacrifice of materials, such as have been noted above, liquids were offered as libations. These were very common (e. g. Speleers, *Catalogue*, p. 33; Delaporte, *Mus. Guim.*, Vol. XXXI, p. 216, fig. 13), the usual liquid being water, although wine and oil were also probably used.

Other forms of divine service were common, such as liver divination, dedications of objects, and consecrations of persons and things, but the seal cylinders give very little evidence of them (Qß 38, 37). But prayer always played a prominent part in divine

service. In fact, wherever the altar is not represented on these seals, it may be taken for granted that the scene depicts not a sacrifice, but a simple service of invocation or adoration (e. g. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 61, 122—127), and on the Cassite seals some of these prayers are recorded (cf. RA 16; Ward PM 121). Nor was music absent at both sacrificial and devotional services, as such a seal cylinder as Ward WA 539 would indicate, although our seals are very reticent on this subject.

ZUR ASSYRISCH-BABYLONISCHEN GESCHICHTE

Von ERNST F. WEIDNER

I

Ein Bruchstück der Annalen Nabonids

SEIT einigen Jahren sind uns zwei Texte¹ bekannt, in denen Nabonid, der letzte Herrscher des neubabylonischen Reiches, berichtet, daß er um den Sin-Tempel Egišširgal in Uruk eifrig bemüht gewesen sei und dort seine Tochter Bêl-šalti-Nannar als „Hohe Priesterin“ (*entu*)² eingesetzt habe. Diese beiden Urkunden lösen das Rätsel, welches mit einem seit vielen Jahren bekannten kleinen Textfragment bisher verknüpft war. Wir können nun erkennen, daß es für die Geschichte der Zeit Nabonids von außerordentlicher Bedeutung ist.

Im Jahre 1892 veröffentlichte J. N. Straßmaier in *Hebraica* IX, p. 5 den Text Sp. II, 407. Da es sich nur um ein verhältnismäßig kleines Bruchstück handelt, so wußte er bei dem Mangel an jeglichem Vergleichsmaterial natürlich nicht viel damit anzufangen, erkannte aber bereits damals mit klarem Blick, daß mit Nebukadnezar, dem Sohne Ninurta-nâdin-šumis, der in Vs. 6 genannt wird, Nebukadnezar I. (1146—1123 v. Chr.) gemeint ist. Der einzige, der sich später eingehender mit dem Texte befaßt hat, war Hugo Winckler.³ Er meinte, daß die Vorderseite eine

¹ Clay, YOS I, p. 66—75, pl. XXXIII—XXXV (Nr. 45) und Dhorme, RA XI, 3, 1914, p. 112, Kol. II, 8—14 (vgl. p. 109, 113). Zum Texte Clay vgl. Koschaker, *Rechtsvergl. Studien zur Gesetzgebung Hammurapis*, S. 232—234. Beide Texte berichten über das gleiche Ereignis in stark abweichender Form, da der Text Clay ausschließlich dem Bericht über die Einsetzung der Bêl-šalti-Nannar als „Hohe Priesterin“ gewidmet ist, während der Text Dhorme von vielen den Göttern wohlgefälligen Taten Nabonids berichtet. Ein Duplikat zum Text Dhorme ist in CT XXXVI, pl. 21—23 veröffentlicht.

² Vgl. Dhorme, RA XI, 3, p. 106 f.; Landsberger, ZA XXX, S. 71—73.

³ KAT³, S. 107; OLZ 1906, Sp. 334 f.; KT³, S. 56 f.

Inscrip't Nebukadnezars I., die Rückseite eine Inscrip't Nebukadnezars II. enthalte, hat sich damit allerdings in einem durch die Sachlage erklärlichen Irrtum befunden. Die Lösung des Rätsels brachte erst die von Clay neu veröffentlichte Inscrip't Nabonids. Ich stelle zum Vergleich Sp. II, 407, Vs. 5—8 und Clay, YOS I, pl. XXXIII f., Kol. I, 29—33 (vgl. p. 70) nebeneinander:

Sp. II, 407, Vorderseite.

5. [] ^{aban} ^{narû}
 6. [] ^m ^d *Nabû-kudurri-ušur* *šar Bâbili^{ki}* ^{mâr} ^m ^d *Nin-urta-na-din-šumi*
 7. [] *ša-lam enti par-ši-šu al-ka-ka-ti-šu*
 8. [] *-di-e-šu šaṭ-ru*
 Clay, YOS I, pl. XXXIII f., Kolumne I.
 29. ^{aban} ^{narû} *la-bi-ri ša* ^d *Na-bi-um-ku-dur-ri-û-šur*
 30. ^{mâr} ^m ^d *Nin-urta-na-din-šû-mi* *šar pa-na ma-aḫ-ra-a*
 31. *ša ša-lam enti ba-aš-mu ši-ru-uš-šu*
 32. *si-ma-a-ti-šû lu-bu-uš-ta-šû ù ti-ik-ni-šû*
 33. *it-ti-i iš-tu-ru*

Wenn auch die beiden Textstellen nicht wörtlich übereinstimmen, so dürfte doch ein Blick genügen, um festzustellen, daß es sich hier und dort um die gleiche Tatsache handelt: Auffindung einer alten Urkunde Nebukadnezars I., auf der die durch diesen König erfolgte Einsetzung einer „Hohen Priesterin“ im Tempel Egišširgal zu Uruk erzählt wurde. Nabonid nimmt die alte Tradition wieder auf und verleiht seiner Tochter Bêl-šalti-Nannar die gleiche Würde. Da nun in beiden Texten dieselbe Tatsache in ähnlichen Ausdrücken erzählt wird, so wird, da die Auffindung einer alten Königsurkunde und die Einsetzung einer „Hohen Priesterin“ gewiß nichts Alltägliches war, nur der eine Schluß möglich sein, daß beide Texte aus der Zeit des gleichen Herrschers stammen. Dann ist also Sp. II, 407 ein Bruchstück einer Inscrip't Nabonids¹. Diese Feststellung ist von höchster Bedeutung für die historische Verwertung der Rückseite des Textes. Ich lasse davon zunächst Umschrift und Übersetzung folgen:

¹ Dazu stimmt auch die weitere Tatsache, daß der Text in neubabylonischer Schrift geschrieben ist.

-
- I. [. *ku(?)*]-*un libbi*^δ [ⁱ]
2. [.] . . . -*ti ur-ḫi šadê ú* . . . [.]
3. [. *ú(?)*]-*r[u(?)*]-*uḫ mu-ú-tum* ^{is} *kakku in-na* . . . [. . . .]
4. [.] *nišê*^{pl} *mât* *Ḥat-tum ina* ^{arab} *Airi šatti III*^{kan}
5. [.] *Bâ* *bili*^{ki} *pa-ni šabê*^{pl} *šū iṣ-ba-tu*
6. [.] *i* *d-ki-e-ma ina 13-ta* *ūmu*^{neu} *a-na*
7. [.] *ki(?)*]-*i ik-šū-du ša nišê*^{pl} *a-ši-bi* ^{al} *Am-ma-na-nu*
8. [.] *-šū-nu kaḫḫadê*^{pl} *-šū-nu u-bat-tiḫ-ma*
9. [.] . . . *i-lu-ul-ma*
10. [.] . . . -*ša-az* . . .
11. [.] . . . [.]
-

-
- I. [.] *Bestän*] *digkeit* des Herzens [.]
2. [.] . . . Pfade des Gebirges . . . [.]
3. [.] *Pf*] *ad* des Todes die Waffe . . . [.]
4. [.] die Leute von Ḥatti. Im Airu des 3. Jahres,
5. [als er . . . in Ba]bylon sich an die Spitze seiner Truppen
gesetzt hatte,
6. [.] *b*]ot er auf und in 13 Tagen nach
7. [., *a*]ls er (dorthin) gelangt war, von den Leuten, die
die Stadt Ammananu bewohnen,
8. [. . . .] ihre [. . . .], ihre Köpfe schlug er ab und
9. [.] . . . hängte er und
10. [.]
11. [.]
-

Die Ereignisse, über die in den Zeilen 1—4 berichtet wird, spielen sich im zweiten Jahre Nabonids ab. Der König führt anscheinend in einer Gebirgsgegend Krieg. Da in Z. 4 das Land Ḥatti genannt wird, womit in neubabylonischer Zeit das Gebiet von Karkemiš und die Landstrecken westwärts bis zum Mittelländischen Meer bezeichnet werden¹, so ist das Gebirge anscheinend der Amanus. In der Nabonid-Kyros-Chronik wird in dem Abschnitt, der dem

¹ S. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, S. 269—273.

2. Jahre Nabonids (554 v. Chr.) gewidmet ist,¹ berichtet, daß sich der König im Tebet des Jahres in der Gegend von Hamath befunden habe. Das stimmt durchaus zu dem Bericht unseres Textes, denn Hatti ist der nördliche Nachbar von Hamath. Hier hat Nabonid anscheinend die kalte Jahreszeit zugebracht.

Im Airu des 3. Jahres (553 v. Chr.) begibt sich dann der babylonische König nach Babylon zurück, reorganisiert dort sein Heer und bricht im Monat Ab, wie wir sogleich sehen werden, von neuem nach dem Westlande auf. Hier erobert er die Stadt Ammananu und metzelt ihre Bewohner nieder. Damit bricht unser Fragment ab. Zu der Stadt Ammananu ist gewiß das Gebirge Ammananu zu stellen, das bei Tiglatpileser III.² und Sanherib³ genannt wird. Winckler hat es wohl mit Recht mit dem Antilibanon identifiziert⁴. Nun heißt es in der Nabonid-Kyros-Chronik, daß Nabonid im Monat Ab des 3. Jahres nach dem Gebirge Ammananu zog.⁵ Damit wird ohne Zweifel auf das gleiche Ereignis angespielt, über das in den Zeilen 4—11 unseres Textes berichtet wird. Wir können dann dort am Anfang von Z. 6 ohne Bedenken „im Monat Ab“ ergänzen und sehen andererseits, daß die Stadt Ammananu wirklich mit dem Gebirge Ammananu zusammenzustellen ist.⁶ Sie wird die Hauptstadt im Bereiche des Antilibanon gewesen sein.

Das Ergebnis unserer Untersuchung ist nun also, daß wir in Sp. II, 407 ein Bruchstück der Annalen Nabonids vor uns haben, welches über die Ereignisse der Jahre 2 und 3 des Königs berichtet. Die gerade für diese Jahre sehr stark zerstörten Angaben der Nabonid-Kyros-Chronik werden wesentlich ergänzt. Hierin liegt

¹ Vorderseite, Kol. I, 9 a—c (Winckler, UAOG, S. 154; Schrader, KB III, 2, S. 128 f.; Hagen, BA II, S. 216 f.).

² Rost, *Keilschrifttexte Tiglatpilesers III.*, S. 74, Z. 26; Winckler, AOF II, S. 3, Rs. 8.

³ Meißner-Rost, *Bauinschriften Sanheribs*, S. 12, Z. 45.

⁴ Winckler, *Alttestamentl. Untersuch.*, S. 131 und KAT³, S. 190. Vgl. auch Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, S. 189³.

⁵ Vorderseite, Kol. I, Z. 10b.

⁶ Das Land Amnanu, als dessen König sich Singāšid und Šamaš-šum-ukin bezeichnen, hat mit unserer Stadt Ammananu gewiß nichts zu tun. Es wird sich um eine babylonisch-elamische Grenzlandschaft handeln (s. Streck, VAB VII, S. CCLIX, Anm. 1).

der Hauptwert unseres kleinen Fragmentes.¹ Wir erkennen nun deutlich, daß Nabonid in den ersten Jahren seiner Regierung eifrig bemüht war, die Eroberungen seines großen Vorgängers Nebukadnezar II. im Westlande und in Syrien zu halten. Erst als er sah, daß alle Bemühungen vergebens waren und eine Besetzung nach der anderen verloren ging, ist er immer mehr in Lethargie versunken und jener fromme Träumer auf dem Königsthron geworden, der nur für die Inschriften uralter königlicher Vorgänger und für den Wiederaufbau zerfallener Tempel und Heiligtümer Interesse hatte.

II

Die babylonischen Könige der Amarnazeit

DAS Königslisten-Fragment VAT 11 262² aus Assur behandelt die Amarnazeit. Leider ist aber nur die assyrische Spalte erhalten, und so blieben bisher, wenn auch die Reihe der assyrischen Könige nunmehr endgültig feststeht, doch immer noch erhebliche Zweifel, wie die Reihe der babylonischen Könige für diese so überaus wichtige Periode der vorderasiatischen Geschichte zu rekonstruieren sei. Ich habe in MVAG 1915, 4, S. 62 f.³ und 1921, 2, S. 54—57 zwei Rekonstruktionsversuche veröffentlicht, doch dürften sie beide kaum restlose Befriedigung ausgelöst haben. Das veranlaßt mich,

¹ Wahrscheinlich sind Vorder- und Rückseite bei Straßmaier zu vertauschen. Der Text wird mit einer ausführlichen historisch-politischen Einleitung begonnen haben und zum Schluß in eine Bau- und Weihinschrift ausgelaufen sein.

² S. Weidner, MVAG 1915, 4, S. 3; Schroeder, KAV, Nr. 11.

³ W. F. Albright hat es im *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* VII, 1921, p. 85 und in RA XVIII, 1921, p. 83—94 für nötig befunden, wegen meiner chronologischen Aufstellungen in MVAG 1915, 4 schwere persönliche Ausfälle gegen mich zu richten. Da er in RA XVIII, p. 83 selbst erklärt, daß die meisten seiner Ausstellungen durch MVAG 1921, 2 gegenstandslos geworden seien, so wundert es mich um so mehr, daß er seine Arbeit gleichwohl in dieser Form erscheinen ließ. Im übrigen weiß er sachlich anscheinend wenig vorzubringen und läßt mich dafür Dinge behaupten, die mir selbst gänzlich unbekannt sind. So habe ich keineswegs Semiramis mitgezählt, um die Zahl 82 für die assyrischen Könige zu erhalten, wie er mir ohne den Schatten eines Beweises nachsagt. Wenn er daher den Mangel an tatsächlichem Material durch eine gereizte persönliche Form ersetzt, für die mir jedes Verständnis fehlt, so darf ich wohl im Hinblick auf das Urteil eines wirklichen Kenners der altorientalischen Geschichte (AJSL XXXVIII, p. 225 ff.) darauf verzichten, mich näher mit seinen Ausführungen zu beschäftigen.

das Problem hier noch einmal aufzurollen, auch mit Rücksicht auf neues Material, das inzwischen zu meiner Kenntnis gelangt ist.

Das folgende Material liegt für die babylonischen Herrscher der Amarnazeit vor:

1 Nach der Synchronistischen Geschichte¹ war Ašir-bêl-nišešu der Zeitgenosse eines babylonischen Königs Kara-indaš. Dieser ist gewiß mit dem Kara-indaš identisch, der nach Burnaburiaš II.² zuerst mit einem ägyptischen König diplomatische Beziehungen angeknüpft hat.

2 Kadašman-Ḫarbe, der Sohn und Nachfolger des Königs Kara-indaš, wurde bei einem Aufstand erschlagen. Darauf bestieg sein Sohn Kurigalzu den babylonischen Thron.³

3 Nach einem von King veröffentlichten Tonkegel⁴ ist Kurigalzu, der Sohn des Kadašman-Ḫarbe, ein Vorgänger eines Königs Kadašman-Enlil.

4 Nach Burnaburiaš II.⁵ hat auch ein babylonischer König Kurigalzu im Briefwechsel mit dem zeitgenössischen ägyptischen Pharao (wahrscheinlich Amenhotep III.) gestanden. Er ist gewiß nach Kara-indaš, der als erster den Verkehr mit Ägypten aufnahm, und wohl unmittelbar vor Kadašman-Enlil I. einzusetzen.

5 Kadašman-Enlil I. war ein Zeitgenosse Amenhoteps III. (1415—1381).⁶

6 Burnaburiaš II. war der Sohn Kadašman-Enlils I.⁷ und Zeitgenosse Amenhoteps IV. (1380—1364) und Ašur-uballiṣ.⁸ Nach den Urkunden aus Nippur hat er mindestens 25 Jahre regiert.⁹

7 Kurigalzu III. war ein Sohn Burnaburiaš II.¹⁰

¹ Vs. I, 1—4 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).

² Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 10, 8.

³ Synchr. Geschichte I, 8—17 und Chronik P I, 5—14 (s. MVAG 1915, 4, S. 53, Anm. 3). Zur Kritik beider Überlieferungen s. unten S. 126 f.

⁴ King, *Boundary-Stones*, Nr. 1, Kol. I, 4—7. II, 3. Vgl. bereits Winckler, ZA II, S. 308 f. S. ferner CT XXXVI, pl. 6, I, 1—7.

⁵ Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 9, 19.

⁶ Knudtzon, a. a. O., Nr. 1—4.

⁷ Hilprecht, BEUP I, pl. 25, Nr. 68; Thureau-Dangin, JA 1908, Janv., p. 122 ff.

⁸ Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 7—11, 15—16.

⁹ S. Schnabel, MVAG 1908, 1, S. 5.

¹⁰ Synchr. Gesch. I, 16 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38); Nies and Keiser, *Historical, Religious and Economic Texts*, p. 20 f., pl. VIII (Nr. 15; dort ist in Z. 2 natürlich *šar kiššati* zu lesen). In der Reihe der Nippurtexte liegt jedenfalls gegen MVAG 1921, 2, S. 55 keine Lücke vor.

Aus 2, 3, 6 und 7 lassen sich die folgenden Reihen babylonischer Könige aufstellen:¹⁰

- 2 Kara-indaš,¹
Kadašman-Ḫarbe,
Kurigalzu
- 3 Kadašman-Ḫarbe,
Kurigalzu
Kadašman-Enlil
- 6 Kadašman-Enlil,
Burnaburiaš
- 7 Burnaburiaš,
Kurigalzu

Aus diesen vier Einzelreihen kann man nun die folgende fortlaufende Reihe babylonischer Könige gewinnen:

- Kara-indaš I.,
Kadašman-Ḫarbe I.,
Kurigalzu II.,
Kadašman-Enlil I.,
Burnaburiaš II.,
Kurigalzu III.

Der Nachfolger Kurigalzus III. ist Nazimaruttaš II. (1319—1294 v. Chr.). Von ihm ab steht die Reihe der babylonischen Könige der Kaššûdynastie zweifellos fest. Kurigalzu III. hat mindestens 23, wahrscheinlich 25 Jahre regiert.² Wir erhalten also für ihn die zeitliche Ansetzung: 1344—1320. Sein Vorgänger Burnaburiaš II. war mindestens 25 Jahre König.³ Er hat also von 1369—1345 regiert. Da Amenhotep IV. von 1380—1364 König von Ägypten war, sind beide Zeitgenossen gewesen. Kurigalzu II. hat dann etwa von 1407—1389, Kadašman-Enlil I. etwa von 1388—1370 regiert. Auch hier trifft es zu, daß die beiden babylonischen Könige Zeitgenossen Amenhoteps III. (1415—1381) waren. Die Reihe der Kaššûkönige von Abirattaš bis Nazimaruttaš II. läßt

¹ Ein Komma hinter dem Namen bedeutet, daß der betreffende König der Vater seines Nachfolgers war.

² S. Schnabel, MVAG 1908, I, S. 5, 11.

³ S. Schnabel, a. a. O., S. 5.

sich dann etwa folgendermaßen rekonstruieren:¹

Abirattaš*	1678—1659
Tazzigurumaš	1658—1639
Harbašipak	1638—1619
<i>Achter König</i>	1618—1599
Agum II.	1598—1579
Kurigalzu I.	1578—1560
Melišipak I.	1559—1541
Nazimaruttaš I.	1540—1522
Burnaburiaš I.	1521—1503
Kaštiliaš II. (III.)	1502—1484
Agum III.	1483—1465
<i>Sechzehnter König</i>	1464—1446
Kara-indaš	1445—1427
Kadašman-Harbe I.	1426—1408
Kurigalzu II.	1407—1389
Kadašman-Enlil I.	1388—1370
Burnaburiaš II.	1369—1345
Kurigalzu III.	1344—1320
Nazimaruttaš II.	1319—1294

Wenn wir nun hierzu die Reihe der assyrischen Könige in MVAG 1921, 2, S. 65 vergleichen, so lassen sich eine ganze Reihe wichtiger Feststellungen machen. Burnaburiaš I. (1521—1503) war der Zeitgenosse des assyrischen Königs Puzur-Ašir IV. (1530—1511). Das wird durch die Synchronistische Geschichte bestätigt.³ Allerdings ist dort der Abschnitt über Puzur-Ašir—Burnaburiaš an eine falsche Stelle geraten, da der Verfasser Burnaburiaš I. und II. verwechselt hat.⁴ Ebenso wird der Synchronismus Kara-indaš (1445—1427)—Ašir-bêl-nišêšu (1450—1431) durch die Synchronistische Geschichte bestätigt.⁵ Völlige Verwirrung scheint aber sowohl in der assyrischen (Synchronistische Geschichte) wie in der babylonischen Überlieferung (Chronik P) über die Geschichte

¹ Danach ist die Tabelle in MVAG 1921, 2, S. 63 zu verbessern.

² Oder Kaštiliaš II.

³ Synchr. Gesch. I, 5—7 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).

⁴ Vgl. MVAG 1915, 4, S. 48.

⁵ Synchr. Gesch. I, 1—4 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).

der Zeit Ašur-uballiṭ zu herrschen. Ich habe zuletzt in MVAG 1915, 4, S. 53, Anm. 3 die damit verknüpften Probleme besprochen, glaube aber heute, daß man auf Grund des neuen Materials zu etwas abweichenden Resultaten kommen wird. Zunächst scheint mir sicher, daß der Verfasser der Synchronistischen Geschichte die Chronik P benutzt hat. Diese aber scheint zwei Dinge zusammengeworfen zu haben, nämlich einerseits die Heirat des Kara-indaš mit der Tochter seines assyrischen Zeitgenossen^{*} und die Ermordung seines Sohnes Kadašman-Ḫarbe I. und andererseits die Einsetzung des Kurigalzu ṣiḫru durch Ašur-uballiṭ. Dieser Kurigalzu ṣiḫru ist entweder identisch mit Kurigalzu II. und dann nicht durch Ašur-uballiṭ eingesetzt worden, oder er ist mit Kurigalzu III., dem Sohne Burnaburiaš II., zu identifizieren, wie auch die Synchronistische Geschichte angibt, und hat dann nichts mit Kara-indaš und Kadašman-Ḫarbe I. zu tun. Die Frage ist sehr schwierig zu entscheiden, kann aber vielleicht ihrer Lösung etwas näher gebracht werden, wenn man versucht, die oben rekonstruierte Liste der babylonischen Könige der Amarnazeit auf VAT 11262 zu übertragen:

1. [x]	Enlil-nâšir II., Aš[ir-râbi I., Ašir-nirâri II.]
2. [Kara-indaš]	Ašir-bêl-niše-[šu]
3. [𐎶]	Ašir-rîm-niše-[šu]
4. [Kadašman-Ḫarbe I.]	Ašur-nâdin-aḫê, Erîba-Adad, Aš[ur-uballiṭ]
5. [Kurigalzu II.]	Enlil-nir[âri]
6. [.]	um-ma-an-[šu]
7. [Kadašman-Enlil I.]	Arik-dên-ilu
8. [Burnaburiaš II.]	𐎶 [𐎶]
9. [Kurigalzu III.]	𐎶 [𐎶]
10. [Nazimaruttaš II.]	[Adad-nirâri I.]

Bei dieser Liste fällt zunächst auf, daß Ašur-uballiṭ, einer der bedeutendsten Könige des mittelassyrischen Reiches, der zweifellos längere Zeit regiert hat, mit seinen beiden Vorgängern Ašur-nâdin-aḫê und Erîba-Adad in eine Zeile gepreßt ist, während seinem

* Dieser ist wohl Ašir-bêl-nišešu, Ašir-rîm-nišešu oder Ašur-nâdin-aḫê gewesen.

zweiten Nachfolger Arik-dên-ilu, über dessen Zeit wir wenig wissen, nicht weniger als drei Zeilen reserviert sind. Wäre dieser wirklich der Zeitgenosse von Kadašman-Enlil I., Burnaburiaš II. und Kurigalzu III. gewesen, so hätte er mindestens 60—70 Jahre regieren müssen, was doch wohl als im höchsten Grade unwahrscheinlich gelten kann. Ferner lehren die Urkunden von Amarna einwandfrei, daß nicht Arik-dên-ilu, sondern Ašur-uballiš der Zeitgenosse Burnaburiaš II. gewesen ist. In unserem Text sind sie aber weit voneinander getrennt. Nun würde unser Fragment VAT 11262 dem Stück der großen Königsliste Assur 4128 entsprechen, das am Anfang der zweiten Kolumne abgebrochen ist.¹ In MVAG 1921, 2, S. 22 f. glaube ich gezeigt zu haben, daß die Synchronismen der ersten Kolumne von Assur 4128 gänzlich obskur sind, da der Verfasser gleichnamige Herrscher verwechselt und vor allem nicht bemerkt hat, daß die erste Dynastie des Meerlandes mit der Dynastie von Amurru und der Kaššûdynastie bis auf zwölf Jahre gleichzeitig ist. Diese fehlerhaften Gegenüberstellungen babylonischer und assyrischer Herrscher haben sich anscheinend noch in der ersten Hälfte der zweiten Kolumne fortgesetzt. Wir können daher als sehr wahrscheinlich annehmen, daß die Synchronismen des Fragmentes VAT 11262, das ein Paralleltext zur ersten Hälfte der zweiten Kolumne von Assur 4128 ist, ebenfalls obskur sind und daher in chronologischer Hinsicht nicht weiter ausgenutzt werden können.

Dagegen darf man wohl VAT 11262 zur Aufklärung der Unstimmigkeiten heranziehen, welche die Berichte der Synchronistischen Geschichte und der Chronik P über die Zeit Ašur-uballiš enthalten. In dieser Liste ist als Zeitgenosse des Ašur-uballiš Kadašman-Ḫarbe I. genannt, dem Kara-indaš vorangeht und Kurigalzu II. folgt. Diese zeitlichen Gleichsetzungen stimmen durchaus mit den Angaben der Chronik P überein. Wir werden also als immerhin möglich annehmen können, daß der Verfasser der Chronik P eine Königsliste vom Typus unseres Fragmentes benutzt und, durch ihre fehlerhaften Angaben verleitet, die Ereignisse aus der Zeit des Kara-indaš und Kadašman-Ḫarbe I. in die Epoche Ašur-uballiš

¹ S. MVAG 1921, 2, S. 14 und Tafel II.

verlegt hat. Der Verfasser der Synchronistischen Geschichte, der die Angaben der Chronik P ungeprüft und mit Hinzufügung eigener Fehler übernommen hat, scheint aber wenigstens gemerkt zu haben, daß mit Kurigalzu šihru, den Ašur-uballiṭ einsetzt, Kurigalzu III. gemeint ist. Daher die wohl zutreffende Angabe in Vs. I, 16 der Synchronistischen Geschichte: „Kurigalzu šihru, der Sohn des Burnaburiaš“. Ašur-uballiṭ dürfte also nur ein Zeitgenosse der babylonischen Könige Kadašman-Enlil I., Burnaburiaš II. und Kurigalzu III. gewesen sein. Gegen den letzteren hat dann auch sein Sohn Enlil-nirāri gekämpft. Der Schwiegervater des Kara-indaš aber dürfte Ašir-bêl-nišešu, Ašir-rîm-nišešu oder Ašur-nâdin-aḫê gewesen sein. Der Synchronismus Nazimaruttaš II. — Adad-nirāri I., den ich in Z. 10 unseres Fragmentes ergänzt habe, ist richtig. Hier dürften dann also die leidlich zutreffenden Angaben der Königslisten vom Typus der Texte Assur 4128 und VAT 11262 eingesetzt haben.

In der eben geschilderten Weise scheinen sich mir die chronologischen Schwierigkeiten der Amarnazeit auf Grund des gesamten heute vorliegenden Materials am einfachsten zu lösen. Ob meine Lösung richtig ist, werden freilich erst zukünftige Funde entscheiden. Nachdrücklichst hervorheben aber möchte ich noch, daß die wichtigste Vorarbeit für meinen Lösungsversuch Thureau-Dangin in OLZ 1908, Sp. 275 f. geliefert hat und daß es eigentlich nur nötig ist, seine Ausführungen in Kleinigkeiten richtig zu stellen und zu ergänzen.

III

Die Dynastie von Akkad

DIE Dynastie von Akkad, deren Begründer Šarrukîn war, ist uns dank der neuesten Funde Legrains¹ im Museum der University of Pennsylvania nunmehr sowohl in der Reihentfolge der Herrscher wie in der Zahl ihrer Regierungsjahre lückenlos bekannt. Die

¹ *Museum Journal* 1920, p. 175 ff. 1921, p. 75 ff. Das Hauptstück ist mir zuerst durch eine Abschrift bekannt geworden, die Clay nach Europa geschickt hatte. Daher ist MVAG 1921, 2, S. 47, 59 irrtümlich Clay statt Legrain als Entdecker des neuen Textes angegeben. Vgl. jetzt auch Poebel, ZA XXXIV, S. 39 ff.

Dynastie umfaßt danach folgende Herrscher:¹

Šarrukīn,	55 Jahre
Rimuš,	15 „
Manišusu,	7 „
Narām-Sin,	56 „
Šarkališarri	25 „
Igigi	
Imi	
Nanum	3 „
Ilulu	
Dudu	21 „
Gimil-Dur-ul ²	15 „

Es sind also im Ganzen elf Herrscher, die zusammen 197 Jahre regierten. Eine Schwierigkeit bietet aber noch die Königsliste Scheil,³ die Rs. 8 in der Unterschrift der Dynastie von Akkad liest: „zwölf Könige, die 197 Jahre regierten“. Diese Angabe hat Clay⁴ veranlaßt, zwischen Šarkališarri und Igigi eine Lücke anzunehmen. Dieser Annahme stehen nun aber die beiden Tatsachen gegenüber, daß für einen zwölften Herrscher kein Jahr mehr übrig ist und daß die Königsliste Scheil, Rs. 1 direkt vor den vier gleichzeitig regierenden Königen Igigi, Imi, Nanum und Ilulu bietet: Šar-g[a-lšar-ri].⁵ Wir werden also ohne Zweifel annehmen dürfen, daß die Angabe „zwölf Könige“ der Liste Scheil auf einem Irrtum des Schreibers beruht und daß dafür „elf Könige“ einzusetzen ist.⁶ Wir kennen nunmehr mithin die gesamte Dynastie von Akkad, für deren Herrscher etwa die folgenden Regierungszeiten zu gelten haben:⁷

Šarrukīn	2684—2630
Rimuš	2629—2615

¹ Vgl. Clay, JAOS XLI, 1921, p. 248.

² Für die Lesung vgl. Scheil, RA XVIII, 2, p. 99.

³ *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 1911, p. 608; Thureau-Dangin, *Chronologie*, p. 60; Gadd, *The early Dynasties of Sumer and Akkad*, pl. 2.

⁴ JAOS XLI, 1921, p. 248.

⁵ RA IX, 1912, p. 69.

⁶ Oder ist etwa vor Igigi ein kurzes Interregnum anzunehmen, das in der Königsliste Scheil als „zwölfter König“ gerechnet wäre? Diese Möglichkeit erwägt auch Poebel, ZA XXXIV, S. 46.

⁷ Darnach ist MVAG 1921, 2, S. 62 richtig zu stellen.

Maništusu	2614—2608
Narâm-Sin	2607—2552
Šarkališarri	2551—2527
Igigi	
Imi	
Nanum	2526—2524
Ilulu	
Dudu	2523—2503
Gimil-Dur-ul	2502—2488

SOME NEW BOOKS ON ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago

L'Orient vu de l'Occident. By E. Dinet and Sliman Ben Ibrahim. Paris; Geuthner. Pp. 105, one drawing. Frcs. 4.

L'Arabie préislamique. By Ign. Guidi. Paris; Geuthner. 1921. Pp. 89. Frcs. 6.

Les Penseurs de l'Islam. By Carra de Vaux. First Volume; *Les Souverains; l'Histoire et la Philosophie politique.* Pp. VII, 383. Second Volume: *Les Géographes; les Sciences mathématiques et naturelles.* Pp. 400. Each volume Frcs. 10. Paris; Geuthner. n. d.

Dinet's and Sliman ben Ibrahim's book will probably be given a haughty side glance with a caustic remark in some quarters where a monopoly of scientific knowledge is advertised among friends. We however take it as a book well worthy of notice. The authors' point of view is that the study of Islam — like any other study — should not be divorced from life. Their attitude is like that of the famous French entomologist Fabre, who said to scholastic entomologists, better provided with University honors, *You investigate death, I investigate life.* For this reason our generation is richer by the work of Fabre. For a similar cause our generation will be richer by the work of Dinet. Dinet says that many of the works of learned European Orientalists are monuments of artificial scholarship built without foundation: these painstaking scholars do not know the Eastern soul — a soul which can scarcely be studied in a library, but rather in living the life of the Arab people at least for a while, in having a share of their sorrows and their joys, in forgetting ourselves, our education, our way of thinking — in becoming a little like them. This is not exactly what Dinet says but we think that it gives the substance of his argument as it echoes in our own mind. The author shows how the leading orientalists Dozy, Lammens, Noeldeke, Sprenger, Hurgronje, Grimme, Margoliouth, Huart, contradict each other in their estimate of the character of the founder of Islam. Dinet criticises more especially the work of Lammens — which is very

clever but is not exactly history. The method of the learned Jesuit is very simple: he takes a statement in the Sira, declares that the contrary is true and sets to prove his contention by a similar treatment of texts, whenever these do not strengthen his point. Dinet shows that Lammens' method applied to the gospels would lead to the canonization of Herod and Judas. In another chapter, he takes up Casanova's theory that Mohammed expected to see the end of the world. This theory has not been accepted in scientific circles, as it is really too fanciful, and Dinet disproves it very easily. In the same chapter he shows that Roches' account of a journey to Mecca (*Dix ans à travers l'Islam*) is a mere plagiarism of Burckhardt. Dinet's work is of the greatest value: we hope that it is only a beginning, and that either he or his friends will present their views in a more pretentious form. We shall only remind them that the entomologist Fabre did write quite a little and thereby justified the value of his point of view.¹ As a Christian, we have long felt that in certain academic circles, much learned nonsense has been written on Christ as it has been written on Mohammed. Arm chair investigators are not proper students of Eastern religions — and Christianity is one of these. Unbelievers and men who have no sense of the wonderful and the miraculous are, in their study of religion, as inefficient as a guild of blind men criticising great painters — even though they may loudly proclaim their infallibility. No one can study a great living religion without a willingness to hear through it, the still small voice of a God, who sends down his rain on the just and the unjust and whose light lighteneth every man that cometh into the world. It is the heart that makes the theologian, it is the heart that makes also the student of comparative religion. Dinet's protest came from his heart this is why we judge him right and hope for more from his pen and from his brush.

Guidi's little book is not a cry from the heart — but no such thing as the heart is necessary perhaps when dealing with preislamic Arabia and those brilliant times of cunning warfare and

¹ Dinet has already published a Life of Mohammed, which is very artistically presented, and purposely conservative and uncritical.

gorgeous poetry, altogether barren of a living God. It gives us four popular lectures delivered by him before the Egyptian University of Cairo. The first takes up the northern and central kingdoms of Hira, Ghassan, and Kinda. The lecturer shows that the form of the Thamudic characters proves that at the beginning of our era Yemen was still the main civilizing center in Arabia. In the light of this admission the fourth lecture which deals with South Arabia and Abyssinia is a little disappointing as it limits itself to Himyaritic History and attempts no reconstruction of the earlier Minean and Sabeian period. As a matter of fact, any study of preislamic Arabia should begin from the South, for we find as early as Gudea a mention of Magan, Meluhha, and Gubi, namely the region of Main, Amalek and Juf. The identification of Amalek with Meluhha may be doubtful but its location in Oman is certainly proved by cuneiform sources. Guidi has a perfect right to think that what has been written so far on ancient South Arabia is of little value from a scientific point of view, but we think that the students of the University of Cairo who probably know very little about the South Arabian Inscriptions could very well have been told a little about these still mysterious chapters of Ancient History. The second lecture is on intellectual progress among the Arabs, namely on their poetry and the third on their material progress which was mainly due to Aramaic influence. This influence is established by the use of Aramaic terms in agriculture and the arts, words like lamp, wine, leaven, and those denoting fine clothing and jewels, being borrowed from the same language. The author shows how some of the words came into our own Western vocabulary later through the Arabic. Here again we think that a study of South Arabian antiquities and reliefs would allow us to make less absolute some of Guidi's statements. For instance it is far from certain that lamps were introduced from Aram; Bent found an antique, lamp, inscribed with Himyaritic characters in Hadhramaut. Wine was made in South Arabia. We are perfectly willing to admit that extravagant claims were made for South Arabian culture ten or twenty years ago and Arabists have a right to take a skeptic attitude — but since they choose to say nothing on the subject, we also have a right to remind them that a study of Arabian

civilization which ignores South Arabia before its decadence, is like a survey of the civilization of Palestine which would tell us nothing of the Canaanite civilization before the Egyptian conquest. We may also add to strengthen our argument that Professor Langdon claims that the Semites of Akkad came from South Arabia, a theory which makes preislamic Arabia one of the greatest factors in the development of the world's civilization. He has not yet made public all his arguments in support of his thesis: we can only suppose that it will be partly based on the striking similarity between some verbal forms in South Arabic, Ethiopic, Egyptian and Assyrian. With this qualification, Guidi's popular lectures are an excellent outline of preislamic Arabia — and without qualification, they are the best ever written on the subject.

Baron Carra de Vaux presents to us the two first volume of what is going to be a standard work on Islamic civilization in five volumes. The first volume treats of the sovereigns of Islam who were learned or famous patrons of learning, of Arabian, Persian, and Turkish historians, of political philosophers, proverb-makers and storytellers. The second volume takes up the geographers and travellers, mathematicians, astronomers, physicians, agriculturists, and alchemists. The third volume will take up law, the fourth, theology, the fifth, the new liberalism in Islam. This work is unpedantic but thoroughly scientific; it is comprehensive, without being as dry as an Encyclopedia; it has been slowly written, and yet it reads like a popular book. We do not know whether any orientalist could have done as well; certainly none ever did. In the present chaotic state of Arabic bibliography many will turn to this work for references of uncommon editions and translations. It is therefore to be regretted that the author does did not make mention (on p. 112 of the first volume) of Amar's translation of the Fakhri. The author is very accurate, but we wish that he had not satisfied himself with Arabic sources concerning the foundation of Baghdad, a very ancient city indeed, which is mentioned in cuneiform sources.

The publisher Geuthner is to be congratulated for these distinctive contributions to our knowledge of Islam, each written from a different point of view, but all the works of experts and masters.

AN OLD TESTAMENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1918 TO 1921 INCLUSIVE*

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio

THE results of the great war are still with us. Consequently, there will perhaps be some books and articles which should appear in this bibliography but which have not as yet come to my attention. However, there will always be a few books which will not be considered suitable for a scientific bibliography, and there are many brief notes and even articles, which cannot find a place here. But it is my aim to include every book, article, and note of scientific value in this Archaeological Bibliography. This bibliography continues that published in this JOURNAL in 1919, pp. 19—35.

I. GENERAL

AALDERS, G. C., *Tij-kentering in de Oud-Testamentische Wetenschap*. Kampem: Kok, 1920, pp. 36.

Alte Denkmäler aus Syrien, Palästina und Westarabien. Berlin, Reimer, 1918.

The Annual of the School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920, pp. 92.

BALDENSBERGER, P. J., "The immovable East", PEF 1918, 20—24, 116—121; 1919, 118—122, 159—166; 1920, 161—166.
von BAUDISSLIN, W. W. G., *Festschrift*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1918, pp. 436.

BENTWICH, N., *Palestine of the Jews, Past, Present and Future*. London: Paul, 1918, pp. 304.

BRITISH MUSEUM, *How to observe in Archaeology*. London, 1920, pp. 103.

BUDDE, K., *Festschrift (Beihefte ZATW 34)*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1920.

* This is the archaeological section of the Old Testament bibliography which appears in the *Anglican Theological Review*.

- CANNY, M. A., *An Encyclopaedia of Religions*. London: Routledge & Sons, 1921, pp. 397.
- CLARK, W. E., "The Sandalwood and Peacocks of Ophir" *AJSL* 36, 103—119.
- DALMAN, G., "Der Gilgal der Bibel und die Steinkreise Palästinas", *Palästina-jahrbuch* 15, 5—26.
- DHORME, R. P., "Les Traditions babyloniennes sur les origines", *RB* 1919, 350—371.
- DUSSAUD, R., "Necessity of Excavations at Jerusalem", *R. Hist. Rel.* 79, 319—326.
- EVERTS, W. W., "The Bible and the Amarna Documents", *Rev. & Expos.* 15, 3.
- FRAZER, J. G., *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*. London: Macmillan, 1919, Vol. I, pp. 569, Vol. II, pp. 571, Vol. III, 566.
- GENOCCHI, G., "La Palestina nella geographia e nella storia", *Boll. d. soc. geogr. Italiana* 7, 272—285.
- GRANT, E., *The Orient in Bible Times*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1920, pp. 336.
- HÖLSCHER, G., *Landes- und Volkskunde Palästinas*. Berlin: Göschen, 1918.
- HOMMEL, F., *Orientalistische Studien-Festschrift*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, Bd. II, 1918, pp. 392.
- KARGE, P., *Rephaim*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1918, pp. 755.
- KING, L. W., *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1918, pp. 155.
- KNIGHT, G. A. F., *Nile and Jordan*. London: James Clark, 1921, pp. 572.
- KREALING, E. G. H., *Aram and Israel*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1918, pp. 154.
- KYLE, M. G., *Moses and the Monuments*. Oberlin: Bibliotheca Sacra Company, 1920, pp. 300.
- LEHMANN-HAUPT, C. F., *Festschrift*. Wien: W. Braumüller, 1921, pp.
- LUCKENBILL, D. D., "On Israel's Origins", *AJTh* 22, 24—53.
- MACALISTER, R. A., *A History of Civilization in Palestine*. Cambridge: University Press, 1921, pp. 128.

- MACKENZIE, D., "The Port of Gaza and Excavations in Philistia", PEF 1918, 72—87.
- MERCER, S. A. B., "An Old Testament Archaeological Bibliography, 1914—1917 Inclusive", JSOR 3, 19—35.
- MITCHELL, H. G., "The Modern Wall of Jerusalem", Annual of American School, pp. 28—50.
- MÖLLER, W., "Ein fünftägiger Ausflug nach dem Jordantale im Februar 1914", Palästinajahrbuch 16, 36—46.
- MONTGOMERY, J. A., *The Opportunity for American Archaeological Research in Palestine*. (Smithsonian Report.) Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921, 433—441.
- MOULTON, W. J., "Gleanings in Archaeology and Epigraphy", Annual American School 1, 69—92.
- OFFORD, J., "Archaeological Notes on Jewish Antiquities", PEF 1918, 35—39, 88—92, 132—138, 180—185; 1919, 37—39, 86, 138—140, 182—185; 1920, 77—78, 41—42.
- PETERS, J. P., "The Present Archaeological Outlook in Palestine" JBL 40, 1—22.
- PETERS, J. P., "Thirty Years' Progress in Semitic Studies", Thirty Years of Oriental Studies. Philadelphia: Oriental Club, 1918, pp. 84.
- PETRIE, W. M. F., *Eastern Exploration Past and Future*. London: Constable, 1918, pp. 118.
- PETRIE, W. M. F., "Thirty Years in Egyptology", Exp. T. 33, 110—114.
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Latest Results of Old Testament Archaeology", Exp. T. 33, 37—39.
- SCHECHTER, A., *Palästina, seine Geschichte und Kultur im Lichte der neuesten Ausgrabungen und Forschungen*. Berlin: Lamm, 1918, pp. 106.
- SCHWARTZ, A., "Die Konsekrierung der dritten Stadtmauer Jerusalems", MGWJ 61, 392—411.
- SPRENGLING, M., "The Aramaic Papyri of Elephantine in English" (*Continued*), AJTh 22, 349—375.
- Studia Semitica et Orientalia*. Glasgow: McLehose, 1920, pp. 128.
- THOMSEN, P., *Palästina und seine Kultur in fünf Jahrtausenden nach den neuesten Ausgrabungen und Forschungen dargestellt*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1918, pp. 121.

VINCENT, L. H., "La Palestine dans les papyrus ptolémaïques de Gerza", *RB* 1920, 161—202.

WEILL, R., "La Cité de David", *R. Études Juives* 69, 1—85; 70, 1—36, 149—179; 71, 1—45.

In his inaugural lecture before the University of Amsterdam, **Aalders** emphasizes the fact that we have arrived at a new turning-point in Old Testament studies. **Baldensperger** continues his important cultural studies in the "Immovable East", and **Bentwich** reviews the history and culture of the Jews. The **British Museum** has issued helpful suggestions for travellers in the Near and Middle East, including Palestine. **Clark** discusses the relation between India and the West, including Palestine, in the tenth century B.C. **Dalman** continues his valuable archaeological notes. A good review of the literature on Babylonian traditions about the origin of things is given by **Dhorme**. **Dussaud** calls attention to the necessity of excavations on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem, emphasizing the superiority of the reliability of the dimensions in I Kgs. over those in Ezekiel. **Frazer's** great work in three volumes is a mine of valuable exegetical material. **Grant** writes for the layman, and so does **Hölscher**, in the *Götschen Sammlung*. The prehistoric culture of Palestine and Phoenicia, the fruit of many years of research in Palestine, is given by **Karge**. The material is indispensable to all students of the culture and religion of these two lands. **King** presents the newest material up to 1918 on Creation and Deluge matters. He is at his best on the Semitic side of his work. An immense amount of material dealing with the archaeology and historical relations between Egypt and Canaan from the earliest times until 70 A. D. is presented by **Knight**. He, however, uses very little discrimination in his use of valuable and inferior material. **Kreling** gives an excellent account of the rôle played by the Aramaeans in the world's history. **Kyle** conservatively deals with the light which archaeology sheds upon the period of the patriarchs. **Luckenbill** reminds us of the necessity of keeping before us the history of whole Nearer Orient, when we try to visualize the earliest steps in the political and religious evolution of the Israelites. **Mercer** gives an Old Testament archaeological bibliography for the years 1914—1917. **Moulton's**

article covers the late period only. Offord, who died in 1920, again has placed us in his debt by his interesting archaeological notes. Petrie is always interesting whenever he writes on archaeology, especially, as in this case, when he applies its results to the reconstruction of history. Sayce reviews a few recent works on archaeology. Schwartz treats of the walls of Jerusalem in the times of the Maccabees and Agrippa. Weill gives a detailed account of his excavations in the soil of the primitive city of Jerusalem in his search for the tombs of the kings of Judah.

2. ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY

ARLDT, Th., "Die Völkertafeln der Genesis und ihre Bedeutung für die Ethnographie Vorderasiens", WZKM 30, 264—317.

BARTON, G. A., "Semites", HERE 11, 378.

BLANCKENHORN, M., *Die Steinzeit Palästina-Syriens*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921, pp. 48+26.

CASPARI, W., "Die Personalfrage als Kern der ältesten israelitischen Staatsgründungspläne", OLZ 1920, 49—51, 97—105.

CLAY, A. T., *The Empire of the Amorites*. New Haven; Yale Univ. Press, 1919, pp. 192.

COWLEY, A., "A Passage in the Mesha Inscription", JRAS 1920, 175—184.

CROMPTON, H. F. B., *The Stela of Meša*. London: SPCK, 1919, pp. 16.

DALMAN, G., "Die Stammeszugehörigkeit der Stadt Jerusalem und des Tempels", von Baudissin-Festschrift 107—120.

DESSAU, H., "Die Samaritaner bei den Scriptorum Historiae Augustae", Lehmann-Haupt-Festschrift 124—128.

DIEULAFOY, M., "Balthasar et Darius le Mède", C. R. Acad. Insc. 1919, 184—203.

HUMBERT, P., "Der Deltafürst So' in Hosea 54", OLZ 21, 224—226.

JIRKU, A., "Die Hauptprobleme der Anfangsgeschichte Israels", Beitr. z. Förd. christl. Theol. 22, 86 ff.

JIRKU, A., "Eine hethitische Ansiedlung in Jerusalem zur Zeit von El-Amarna", ZPDV 43, 58—61.

KILLERMANN, S., *Urgeschichte des Menschen*, Regensburg: Verlagsanstalt, 1918, pp. 233.

- KLEBER, A., "The Chronology of 3 and 4 Kings and 2 Parallel. (cum. tab. chron.), *Biblica* 1921, 3—29.
- LANGDON, S., "The Ḫabiru and the Hebrews", *Exp. T.* 31, 324—329.
- LANDERSDORFER, S., "Das hethitische Problem", *Theol. und Glaube* 11, 22—23.
- MAYNARD, J. A., "Were the Phoenicians a Semitic People", *JSOR* 5, 51—55.
- MEINHOLD, J., "Indogermanen in Kanaan?", von Baudissin-Festschrift 331—353.
- MODONA, A. N., "La vita pubblica e privata degli Ebrei", *Aegyptus* 2, 253—275.
- MÖLLER, G., "König Sib'u — סִבְיָה, der ägyptische Gegner Sargons", *OLZ* 1919, 145—147.
- MOULTON, W. J., "Samaritans", *HERE* 11, 161—167.
- PEISER, F. E., "Zum ältesten Namen Kana'ans", *OLZ* 1919, 5—8.
- PINCHES, T. G., "Babylon in the Days of Nebuchadrezzar", *Jr. Trans. Vict. Inst.* 52, 178—208.
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Hittite Name Araunah", *JThS* 22, 267—268.
- SCHMIDTKE, F., "Der Ort der Ermordung Sanheribs", *OLZ* 21, 169—171.
- SCHOLLMEYER, A., "Eine angebliche Parallele zur bibl. Urgeschichte", *Theol. u. Glaube* 10, 248—250.
- SIDERSKY, D., "The Stela of Mesa", *R. Arch.* 10, 59—89.
- STORR, R., "Die Unechtheit der Mesa-Inschriften", *Th. Q. IC*, 196—225, 378—421.
- THOMSON, J. E. H., *The Samaritans*. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1919, pp. 424.
- TORREY, C. C., "A Phoenician Necropolis at Sidon", *Annual Amer. School* 1, 1—27.
- VOLTER, D., *Die Patriarchen Israels im Lichte der Ägypt. Mythologie*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921, pp. 112.
- WEINER, H. M., "The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology", *Bib. Sac.* 75, 561—580.
- WILCKEN, U., "Zu den jüdischen Aufständen in Ägypten", *Hermes* 54, 111 f.

The article by **Barton** contains a good classification of Semitic peoples. **Blanckenhorn** studies early Palestine and Syria in the light of prehistoric Europe and North Africa. **Clay** believes that Amurru takes the place of Arabia as the cradle of the Semitic race. Jerusalem according to **Dalman** belonged to the tribe of Benjamin. **Dieulafoy** points out that the time between the capture of Jerusalem and the edict of Cyrus, freeing the Jews, in 538 was 60 or 49 years, and not 70, as stated in II Chr. 36:31. **Humbert** shows that יצ MT and שו LXX = שו of II Kgs. 17:4. Only part of the Hebrews were ever in Egypt is what **Jirku** holds, and in his second article he shows that Abdi-Habi was a Hittite and was born in Jerusalem, and he concludes that the population of Jerusalem was mostly Hittite. **Killermann** finds many gaps in the early chronology of the Bible. **Kleber** uses Assyrian data in his attempt to bring into accord the statements of Kings and Chronicles. The Hābiru are identified by **Langdon** in a wider sense with the children of Eber. **Langendorfer's** article is popular but good, relating it to Bible phenomena. **Maynard** sees in the Phoenicians a people from the North; while **Meinhold** finds evidence of Indo-Germanic influence in Canaan. A useful study of the Jews in Egypt in the Greek and Roman period is furnished by **Modona**. **Möller** looks upon Sib'u — שו as a mistake for Shabaka. In his article on the Samaritans in HERE, **Moulton** strangely omits Thomson's fine work. **Peiser** thinks that the oldest name of Canaan, though later found as F-n-h, was originally Ki-na-ah-hi; whence the two names Canaan and Phoenicia. The name Araunah, thinks **Sayce** was a title. **Schmidtke** believes that Sennacherib was murdered in Babylon, as against Ungnad. **Schollmeyer** agrees with Witzel's interpretation of the so-called "Epic of Paradise". **Sidersky** makes a fresh and detailed study of the Stela of Mesha and defends its genuineness, while **Storr** takes the opposite view, on the basis of a critical study of the text, and **Cowley** seeks to show that in l. 18 of the text the name Yahweh does not occur. He thinks that the pre-exilic form of the name of Yahweh was Yāw. **Thomson** has written the best account of the Samaritans that exists in English. **Weiner** is polemical but well worth reading.

3. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY

- CHRISTIE, W. M., Tell Hum the Site of Capernaum, *Studia Semitica et Orientalia* 13—34.
- COOK, S. A., "The 'Ain Dūk Mosaic", *PEF* 1920, 142.
- CROSBY, R. L., *The Geography of Bible Lands*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1921, pp. 242.
- DALMAN, G., "Archaeologisches zum Golgathafelsen", *Palästina-jahrbuch* 16, 11—22.
- DALMAN, G., "Die Wasserversorgung des ältesten Jerusalems", *Palästina-jahrbuch* 1918, 47—67.
- DALMAN, K., "Brunnar och Källor i Palestina", *Svenska Jerus. Föreningens Tidskr.* 1918, 104—109.
- DUSSAUD, R., "Un Nom nouveau de Verrier Sidonien", *Syria* 1920, 230—234.
- von GALL, A., "Ein neues astronomisch zu erschließendes Datum der ältesten israelitischen Geschichte", *Budde-Festschrift* 52—60.
- GARDINER, A. H., "The Ancient Military Road between Egypt and Palestine", *JEA* 6, 99—116.
- GUTHE, H., *Die griechisch-römischen Städte des Ostjordanlandes*. Leipzig: Hinrichs 1918, pp. 44.
- GUTHE, H., *Gerasa*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1918, pp. 69.
- HORWITZ, J. W., *אֶבֶל* Jerusalem 11 and 12, 51—73.
- KRAUSS, S., "Drei palästinische Stadtnamen", *OLZ* 1919, 58 ff.
- LUNCZ, A. M., *תחוני צולי בבל*, Jerusalem 11 and 12, 233—310.
- LUNCZ, A. M., *נחקיים תופוגרפיים*, Jerusalem 11 and 12, 325—335.
- LYALL, C. J., *Some Aspects of Ancient Arabia*. London: British Academy 1918, pp. 16.
- OFFORD, J., "On-Anu", *PEF* 51, 123—133.
- PETERS, J. P., "The Home of the Semites", *JAOS* 39, 243—260.
- SCHOFF, W. H., *The Ship Tyre*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920, pp. 156.
- STÄHELIN, F., *Die Philister*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1918, pp. 40.
- STEARNS, W. N., "The Story of Gezer", *Bib. Sac.* 75, 104—117.
- SUTTON, A. W., "The Ruined Cities of Palestine", *Jr. Transact. Vict. Inst.* 52, 11—26.

VERNES, M., "The Moabite Sanctuary of Beth Peor", *R. Hist. Rel.* 76, 241—261.

WIEGAND, T., *Sinai*. Berlin: Vereinigung wissenschaftl. Verleger, 1920, pp. 145.

WILLCOCKS, W., *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan*. London: Spoon, 1919, pp. 100.

The old Jewish sanctuary, 'Ain Dūk, was discovered in 1918. The discovery was discussed in *R. Bibl.* 1919, 532—563, in *JAOS* 1920, 141—142, and finally by Cook in *PEF* 1920, 82—87 and 142. Dussaud shows the importance of Sidon as a centre of glass manufacture. von Gall deduces, in this article, 952 as the date of the first year of Salomon's reign. Gardiner thinks the desert road from El-Ḳantareh to Rafa was the ancient military road from Egypt to Palestine. Horwitz studies the name Abel in the Bible as well as in the Talmud and in Josephus. In his first article Luncz discusses the limits of Palestine in the time of the Return, and in his second article investigates several topographical problems. Offord writes on Heliopolis, as found in a Semitic inscription, and on the Gilgals and Massebas of Palestine. Peters finds the home of the Semites in Asia Minor and the regions eastward and in Armenia. Cf. Clay's position. In his book Schoff studies the commerce of the Bible and attempts to show, that the Tyre of Ezekiel's vision is Babylon. Stähelin sums up in neat fashion all we know at present about the Philistines, while Stearns traces the history of Gezer back as far as 3000 B. C. Sutton discourses on cities both east and west of the Jordan, and Vernes believes that Moses received the law and gave it to Israel at the Moabite Sanctuary of Beth-Peor. Wiegand records many valuable observations on the identification of Old Testament geographical names. To Willcocks we are indebted for an original and suggestive study.

4. ARCHAEOLOGY AND LITERATURE

AALDERS, G. C., "Palestijnsche vertellingen", *Geref. Theol. Tijdschr.* 19, Nr. 12.

ALBRIGHT, W. F., "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph", *JBL* 37, 111—143.

- ALBRIGHT, W. F., "The Mouth of the Rivers", *AJSL* 35, 161-195.
- ALBRIGHT, W. F., "Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology", *AJSL* 34, 81-98, 215-255.
- ASTLEY, H. J. D., "Survivals of Primitive Cults in the Old Testament", *Interpr.* 15, 90-97, 206-215.
- ASTLEY, H. J. D., "Mythology in the Psalms", *Interpr.* 14, 305-315.
- BALL, C. J., "Daniel and Babylon", *Exp. T.* 19, 235-240.
- BERGMANN, J., *Die Legenden der Juden*. Berlin: Schwetschke, 1919, pp. 166.
- BEWER, J. A., "Ancient Babyonians Parallels to the Prophecies of Haggai" *AJSL* 35, 128-133.
- BUDDE, K., "'Der von Norden' in Joel 2:10", *OLZ* 1919, 1-5.
- CASPARI, W., "Tohuwabohu", *Hommel-Festschrift* 1-20.
- CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C., "La Mosaïque juive de 'Ain Douq", *C. R. Acad. Insc.* 1919, 87-120.
- COWLEY, A., *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra*. London: SPCK, 1919, pp. 100.
- DALMAN, G., "Die Tobia-Inschrift von 'arāk el-emīr und Daniel 11:14", *Palästina-jahrbuch* 16, 33-35.
- DHORME, R. P., "L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien", *RB* 1920, 465-506; 1921, 517-540.
- DOUMERGUE, E., *Moïse et la Genèse d'après les travaux de M. le professeur E. Naville*. Paris: Edition de Foi et Vie, 1920, pp. 121.
- EBELING, E., "A Specimen of Babylonian Wisdom Literature", *MVAG* 1918, 50-70.
- EBERHARTER, A., "Der Brudermord Kains im Licht der ethnologischen und religionsgeschichtl. Forschung", *ThQ* 98, 67-76, 355-365.
- EDWARDS, C., *The Hammurabi Code*. London: Watts & Co., 1921, pp. 132.
- EWING, W., "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Higher Criticism", *Exp. T.* 18, 451 ff.
- FISCHER, O., *Orientalische und griechische Zahlensymbolik*. Leipzig: Altmann, 1918, pp. 59.
- FULLERTON, L., "The procession of Nehemiah", *JBL* 1919, 171-179.
- GRAY, G. B., "Job, Ecclesiastes and a New Babylonian Literary Fragment", *Exp. T.* 31, 440-443.

- GUNKEL, H., "Das Königsschloß von Susa und das Buch Esther", ThLZ 44, 2—4.
- HAUPT, P., "Zerubbabel and Melchizedek", JSOR 2, 76—82.
- HAUSRATH, A., *Archiqar and Asop*. Heidelberg: Winter 1918, pp. 48.
- HOMMEL, F., "Zu Genesis 14", BZ 15, 213—218.
- JAMES, J. C., *The Languages of Palestine and Adjacent Regions*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1920, pp. 267.
- JAMES, M. R., *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. London: SPCK, 1920, pp. 111.
- JENSEN, P., "Die Joseph-Träume", v. Baudissin-Festschrift 233-245.
- JEREMIAS, J., *Der Gottesberg*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1919, pp. 160.
- KREALING, E. G. H., "The Tower of Babel", JAOS 40, 276—281.
- LANGDON, S., "The Sumerian Original of the Biblical Ellasar", JRAS 1920, 515.
- LUCKENBILL, D. D., "The Ashur Version of the Seven Tablets of Creation", AJSL 38, 12—35.
- MANN, J., "The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim", JQR 8, 339—366; 9, 139—180; 10, 121—152, 309—366.
- MAYNARD, J. A., "Hebrew or Akkadian", ATR 3, 284-299; 4, 29-45.
- MELAMED, R. H., "The Targum to Canticles according to Six Yemen MSS, compared with the Textus Receptus", JQR, 10, 377—410; 11, 1—20; 12, 57—109.
- MERCER, S. A. B., "A New Turning Point in the Study of Creation", ATR 3, 1—17.
- MORGENSTERN, J., "The Sources of the Creation Story", AJSL 36, 169—212.
- PILCHER, E. J., "Signet with Old-Hebrew Inscription", PEF 51, 177—181 (cf. PEF 50, 93—94).
- RANSTON, H., "Ecclesiastes and Theognis", AJSL 34, 99—122.
- REISNER, G. A., "Tirhaqa", Bull. Boston Mus. of Fine Arts 1918, 67—82.
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Scapegoat among the Hittites", Exp. T. 31, 283—284.
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Temple-Mount at Jerusalem" Exp. T., 32, 506—507.

SCHMIDT, H. und KAHLE, P., *Volkserzählungen aus Palästina*.

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1918, pp. 399.

STIEGLECKER, H., "Zur indischen Flutsage", *Kath. Kz.* 59, 9.

TORREY, C. C., "The Bilingual Inscription from Sardis", *AJSL* 34, 185—198.

ZEITLIN, S., "Megillat Taanit", *JQR* 9, 71—102; 10, 49—80; 237—290.

Aalders collects and discusses some Palestinian tales. The various elements in the Story of Joseph, thinks **Albright**, are the product of long evolution. In his second article he contributes many fresh ideas to our knowledge of the Flood and lustration practices. **Astley** discusses Ezek. 8:5—14; Deut. 4:14 ff.; and Is. 65:2—7; 66:3, 17. In his second article he emphasizes the teaching value of the Mythology in the Psalms. **Ball** finds the name Daniel under the form Danya as early as the Hammurabi dynasty. **Bergmann** discusses the religious Haggadah of the Jews. In his article, **Bewer** compares the prophecy of Haggai with the contents of Gudea A and B. **Budde** finds Adapa in Joel 2:20. **Clermont-Ganneau** describes the mosaic pavement of an old fourth century synagogue at Noeros. **Cowley** published 38 texts from Elephantine papyri, with brief notes and an historical introduction. An unsuccessful attack upon the modern interpretation of the Bible is made by a man, who does not know his subject — **Doumergue**. **Ebeling** discusses what he considers a parallel to Ecclesiastes, giving a new transliteration and translation of the text. **Edwards'** book is a new edition, with no improvement on the quality of the first edition. **Ewing** thinks he finds certain results in Thomson's "The Samaritans" which are in conflict with the Higher Critical School. **Fischer** points out the numerical value of the letters of certain important words. **Fullerton** shows the important bearing which Neh. 12:31—39 has upon the probable course of Nehemiah's wall. **Gray** discusses Ebeling's text, and shows the great difference between its contents and the Book of Job. In his article, **Gunkel** argues for the genuineness of the Book of Esther. **Haupt** makes Ps. 110 refer to Zerubbabab. **Hausrath** compares the relationship between Oriental and Greek fables. **Hommel** equates Arioch of Ellasar with Rim-Sin of Larsa. **James**

has published a most stimulating book upon his subject. **M. R. James** gives a list of titles and fragments of lost Apocrypha. **Jeremias'** book is a study in the symbolical language of the Bible. The Tower of Babel, according to **Kreling**, is to be identified with the temple-tower of Borsippa (Birs Nimrud). **Langdon** shows that the Biblical Ellasar = Sumerian Ilasar (= Larsa). **Luckenbill** gives a good rendering of a part of the new version of the Babylonian Creation story. **Mann** treats the *Responsa* as a source of Jewish History. **Maynard** publishes under this title and "Hebrew and Aramaic" a penetrating criticism of Naville's hypothesis of a cuneiform text of the Old Testament. **Mercer's** article seeks to show the independence of the Biblical story of Creation of Babylonian influence, while **Morgenstern** says that the question of the antiquity of the Babylonian myth in Israel is not settled. **Ranston** treats *Theognis* as a possible source for ideas in *Koheleth*. **Reisner** gives an account of his excavations of the pyramids of Nuri, the largest of which proved to be the tomb of Tirhaqa (II Kgs. 19). **Sayce** finds a scapegoat among the Hittites, and in his second article shows that Salem stood on the Temple-hill. **Schmidt and Kahle** publish a series of stories and legends about Palestine, collected by peasants. **Stieglecker** places the Hindu flood-stories midway between the Babylonian and Hebrew in point of worth. *Megillat Taanit* is treated by **Zeitlin** as a source of Jewish chronology and history in the Hellenic and Roman periods.

5. ARCHAEOLOGY AND RELIGION

ALBRIGHT, W. F., "The Babylonian Temple-tower and the Altar of Burnt-Offering", *JBL* 39, 137—142.

ALBRIGHT, W. F., "The Goddess of Life and Wisdom", *AJSL* 36, 258—294.

ALBRIGHT, W. F., "The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos", *JBL* 39, 143—151.

ALT, A., "Ein Grabstein aus Beerseba", *ZDPV* 1919, 177—188.

BARTON, G. A., "Possession" (Semitic and Christian), "Soul" (Semitic and Egyptian), "Stones" (Semitic), "Suicide" (Semitic and Egyptian), *HERE* 10, 133-139; 11, 749-753; 11, 876-877; 12, 38-40.

- BLAIR, D. G., "Stone Altars and Cup-marks in South Palestine".
PEF 1919, 167—174.
- BUTTENWIESER, M., "Blood Revenge and Burial Rites", JAOS
39, 303—331.
- CLERMONT-CANNEAU, C., "Découverte à Jerusalem d'une Synagoge de l'Époque hérodienne", Syria 1, 190—197.
- DIEULAFOY, M., "Communication quarante", C. R. Acad. Insc.
1919, 13—23.
- DUSSAUD, R., *Les Origines cananéennes du Sacrifice israélite*.
Paris: Leroux, 1921, pp. 334.
- EISLER, R., "Jahvehs Hochzeit mit der Sonne", Hommel-Festschrift II, 21—70.
- FABRIDGE, M. H., "Symbolism" (Semitic), HERE 12, 146—151.
- FIEBIG, P., *Juden und Nichtjuden*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke,
1921, pp. 100.
- GRESSMANN, H., "Hadad und Baal", Baudissin-Festschrift 191-216.
- GRESSMANN, H., *Die Lade Jahvehs*. Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1920,
pp. 72.
- HEINISCH, P., *Personificationen und Hypostasen im AT und im Alten Orient*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1921, pp. 60.
- JERKU, A., "iluḪa-bi-ru = der Stammesgott der Ḫabiru-Hebräer",
OLZ 1921, 246—247.
- LANGDON, S., "Babylonian and Hebrew Musical Terms", JRAS
1921, 169—191.
- LANGDON, S., "Gesture in Sumerian and Babylonian Prayer"
JRAS 1919, 531—556.
- LANGDON, S., "Ode to the Word", Mus. Journal 1918, 157—163.
- LATTEY, C., "Ruler-worship in the Bible", Irish Theol. Quart.
14, 238—257.
- LOEHR, M., "The Religion of Israel in the Light of the Religion of the Ancient East", Bib. Sac. 78, 295—318.
- MACALISTER, R. A. S., "Sacrifice" (Semitic), HERE 11, 31—38.
- MEEK, T. J., "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews", AJSL 37,
101—131.
- MERCER, S. A. B., "Was Ikhnaton a Monotheist", JSOR 3, 70-85.
- MERCER, S. A. B., *Growth of Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt*.
Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1919, pp. 109.

- MERCER, S. A. B., "War, War-Gods" (Semitic) "Water, Water-Gods" (Babylonian and Egyptian), *HERE* 12, 708—712, 713—716.
- MEYER, E., *Die Gemeinde des neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus*. Berlin: Vereinigg. wiss. Verleger, 1919, pp. 66.
- MORGENSTERN, J., "The Historical Reconstruction of Hebrew Religion and Archaeology", *Jour. of Rel.* 1, 233—254.
- PATON, L. B., *Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead in Antiquity*. New York: Macmillan, 1921, pp. 325.
- PATON, L. B., "Survivals of Primitive Religion in Modern Palestine", *Annual Amer. School* 51—65.
- PILCHER, E. J., "The Covenant Ceremony among the Hebrews", *PSBA* 40, 8—14.
- PILCHER, E. J., "A Samaritan Periapt", *JRAS* 1920, 343—346.
- PINCHES, T. G., "Tammuz", *HERE* 12, 187—191.
- RIVERS, W. H. R., *Dreams and Primitive Culture*. Manchester: Univ. Press, 1917—1918, pp. 28.
- SCHEFTELOWITZ, I., *Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1920.
- SMITH, J. M. P., "Southern Influence upon Hebrew Prophecy" *AJSL* 34, 1—19.
- SONIES, K., "Over den oorsprong van den Israelitischen sabbat", *Theol. Tijdschr.* 51, 341—364.
- SPERBER, J., "Der Personenwechsel in der Bibel", *ZA* 32, 23, 33.
- VAN HOONACKER, A., "Is the Narrative of the Fall a Myth?" *Exp.* 1918, 373—400.
- VAN LEEUWEN, N. D., *Het Bijbelsch-Akkadisch-Schumerisch Zondvloedverh.* Amsterdam: Van Battenburg, 1920, pp. 411.
- VAN RAVESTEYN, T. L. W., "God en Mensch", *ThSt.* 35, 197—224, 249—270; *BZ* 14, 278.
- VERNES, M., "Religious Employment of Megalithic Monuments by the Ancient Hebrews", *Rev. Arch.* 7, 275—290.
- VERNES, M., "The Brazen Serpent made by Moses, and the Healing Serpent of Esculapius", *Rev. Arch.* 7, 36—49.
- VÖLTER, D., "Die Herkunft Jahwes", *ZATW* 37, 126—133.
- WEBER, O., "Altorientalische Kultgeräte", *Hommel-Festschrift II*, 370—392.
- WELSFORD, E., "Serpent-Worship", *HERE* 11, 399—422.

WENSINCK, A. J., *Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia*. Amsterdam: Müller, 1921, pp. 56.

WOODHOUSE, W. J., "Slavery", *HERE* 11, 595—631.

WORREL, W. H., "The Demon of Noonday and some related Ideas", *JAOS* 38, 160—166.

The Assyrian etymology of Ariel is upheld by Albright in his first article. In his second he discusses the Serpent and the Fall; and in his third he is against a Babylonian derivation of the Logos. This is in contrast to Langdon's position. Barton's articles are excellent, with one exception, namely, that on "Soul". In his article *Buttenwieser* denies the existence in Israel of the notion that violent death called for vengeance only as long as the blood remained uncovered. Clermont-Ganneau publishes a Greek inscription discovered on the Hill of Ophel in 1914. It records the erection of a Synagogue of the time of Herod, possibly the Synagogue of the Libertines (Acts 6:9). Dussaud's book is full and thorough. His position is opposed to Wellhausen. Fiebig's book is a rather unscientific polemic against Fritsch, *Handbuch der Fudenfrage*. Gressmann's article is a study of Amarna Letters Egyptian texts. The Ark, according to Gressmann came from Canaan. Heinisch discusses, among other things, the Spirit of God and the Angel of Jahweh in the Old Testament. Jirku agrees with Langdon on the problem of the H̄abiru. Langdon's first article throws much light upon titles in the Hebrew Psalter, e. g., *āl shōshannīm* = "on the three-toned instrument"; *shigu* = penitential psalm = *shiggāyôn*. His second article contains much that is questionable, but his article in the *Museum Journal* is excellent. Meek thinks that Yaweh was the tribal god of Judah only. Mercer fails to find a real monotheism in Egypt. His two books on Egypt and Babylon throw much light upon problems in Old Testament religion. His articles in Hasting's *ERE* collect all the available material. Meyer says that the Zadokites were a religious society in Damascus, and arose during the first half of the second century B.C. Morgens-tern emphasizes the value of archaeology. Paton finds similar psychical manifestations in antiquity to those so popular to-day, but most of his deductions are false. In his second article Pilcher describes an amulet in Greek and Samaritan — the oldest of its

kind. It must have been an oversight that **Pinches** did not discuss Tammuz in his relation to the Old Testament. **Scheftelowitz** discusses some interesting OT sections, such as, Is. 45:6f.; 50:10f. **Smith** holds that ethical Yahwism and its prophets came into Canaan from the south, where Israel came into touch with the sages and seers of Egypt. **Van Leeuwen's** book is a very thorough discussion of the subject, making full use of all new material. **Van Ravesteijn's** book is a Babel en Bijbel contribution. **Vernes** in his first article thinks that the Hebrews adopted megalithic cromlechs by making the twelve stones symbolize the twelve tribes of Israel. In his second article, he advances the theory that the scene of the elevation of the brazen serpent was at or near Obot in eastern Arabia. **Weber** discusses the origin of the Ark of Jehovah. **Welsford's** article is very disappointing from a Semitic and Egyptian point of view. **Worrell** interprets the Demon of Noonday as a sickness demon.

6. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GENERAL CULTURE

- APTOWITZER, V., "Schenke und Schenkin", WZKM 30, 359-365.
- BAUER, H., *Zur Entzifferung der neuentdeckten Sinaischrift und zur Entstehung des Semitischen Alphabets*. Halle: Niemeyer, pp. 27.
- BEER, G., *Die soziale und religiöse Stellung der Frau im israelitischen Altertum*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1919, pp. 47.
- BOEHL, F. M. Th., "The Position of Women in Ancient Babylonia and Israel", *Bib. Sac.* 77, 4-13; 186-197.
- BRINDLEY, H. H., "A Graffito of a Ship at Beit Jibûn", *PĒF* 1919, 76-78.
- DIEULAFOY, M., "The Number Forty in Antiquity", *C. R. Acad. Inscr.* 1919, 13-23.
- EISLER, R., "Entdeckung und Entzifferung kenitischer Inschriften aus dem Anfang des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. im Kupferminen-gebiet der Sinaihalbinsel", *BZ* 1919, 19, 1-8.
- EISLER, R., *Die kenitischen Weihinschriften der Hyksoszeit im Bergbauggebiet der Sinaihalbinsel*. Freiburg: Herder: 1919, pp. 179.
- FRIDMANN, L., "L'organization militaire des Hébreux", *Bulletin de la Soc. de Géog. d'Alger* 23, 70-84.
- GRESSMANN, H., "Die Haartracht der Israeliten", *Budde-Festschrift* 61-68.

- HERRMANN, J., "Der Ursprung unseres Alphabetes nach neuen Forschungen und Funden", ThLbl 39, 241—247, 257—262, 297—304.
- HERRMANN, J., "Der Ursprung des Alphabetes", OLZ 40, 27—32; 51—57.
- JASTROW, M., "An Assyrian Law Code", JAOS 41, 1—59.
- KENNEDY, A. R. S., "Jewish Everyday Life as reflected in the Mishnah Treatise Shabbath", Studia Semitica 35—48.
- KITTEL, R., *Kriege in biblischen Landen*. Gotha: Perthes, pp. 82.
- LEHMANN-HAUPT, C. F., "Zur Herkunft des Alphabetes", ZDMG 73, 51—79.
- LACH, R., "Orientalistik und vergleichende Musikwissenschaft", WZKM 29, 463—501.
- LUCKENBILL, D. D., "Possible Babylonian Contributions to the So-called Phoenician Alphabet", AJSL 36, 27—39.
- LUNDFIELD, H. S., "The Relation of Jewish to Babylonian Law", AJSL 36, 40—66.
- MASTERMAN, E. W. G., "Hygiene and Disease in Palestine", PEF 1918, 13—19, 56—71, 112—117, 156—171; 1919, 27—36.
- MERCER, S. A. B., "New Evidence on the Origin of Israel's Laws", ATR 4, 314—324.
- NEUBAUER, J., "Beiträge zur Geschichte des biblisch-talmudischen Eheschließungsrechts", MVAG 1919—1920, 1—249.
- OLMSTEAD, A. T., "Wearing the Hat", AJTh 24, 94—111.
- PETRIE, W. M. F., "The Origin of the Alphabet", Scientia 24, 1—7.
- RICHTER, G., "Die Kesselwagen des salomonischen Tempels", ZDPV 41, 1—34.
- ROSCHER, W. H., *Der Omphalosgedanke bei verschiedenen Völkern, besonders den semitischen*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1918, pp. 115.
- ROSCHER, W. H., *Die Zahl 50 in Myth, Kultus, Epos und Taktik der Hellenen und anderer Völker, besonders der Semiten*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1918, pp. 134.
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Origin of the Semitic Alphabet", JRAS 1920, 297—303.
- SCHEIL, V., "A Sumerian Code of Laws", Mus. Jr. 11, 130—132.
- SOUTZO, M., "Assyrian-Babylonian Weights", C. R. Acad. Insc. 1919, 150—157.

WATERMAN, L., "Pre-Israelite Laws in the Babylonian Code", *AJSL* 38, 36—54.

ZAPLETAL, V., "Der Wein in der Bibel", *BS* 20, 1—66.

Aptowitz discusses the relationship between *Ḥammurabi* § 110 and the Hebrew law. **Bauer** opposes the theory held by **Sethe** and **Gardiner** about the Phoenician alphabet. **Woman** is assigned a very high place by **Beer**, but **Boehl** holds that that was true only of the period before the Captivity. A special quality was attributed to the number 40 by the pyramid builders in Egypt, and **Dieulafoy** thinks that it was adopted by the Hebrews. **Eisler** thinks that the Sinai inscriptions contain Semitic writing, influenced by the hieroglyphic. The language is a Canaanitish dialect, of the Hyksos period. **Gressmann** describes the ancient Hebrews as wearing long head-hair, pointed beard and short moustache. **Jastrow** translates the new Assyrian law code, but makes numerous grammatical blunders; compare **Scheil's** translation of the same. **Lehmann-Haupt** discusses the Sinai inscriptions, deriving them from Egypt. **Luckenbill** believes that the author of the Sinai inscriptions drew upon both Babylonian and Egyptian systems. A definite relationship is found between Babylonian and Hebrew law by **Lunfield**. **Masterman's** article treats of modern and Bible times. **Mercer** studies the new Assyrian Code, and finds that while it is closely related to previous Babylonian and Assyrian law, it adds to evidence which militates against any close relationship between Babylonian and Hebrew law. **Olmstead** writes of the limitations of Hellenization and the inevitableness of Oriental reaction. **Petrie** adds his weight to the theory that the alphabet owes much to Egyptian sources. **Roscher** presents a servicable collection of material — including OT material — on the navel of the earth. He, however, frequently falls into error, for example, when he says, that the Samaritan temple originated in the time of Alexander. **Sayce** adds his word to the problem of the alphabet, saying that the characters are Egyptian but their values are Semitic. **Scheil** discusses what seems to be a part of the source of the *Ḥammurabi* code. **Soutzo** presents some interesting material. He thinks, for example, that the kernel of wheat was used as a standard of weight in Babylonia, and he estimates that the Hebrew talent weighed 864,000 kernels.

REVIEWS

Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu den altassyrischen Gesetzen. (MVAG 1921, 3.) Von Paul Koschaker. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921, pp. 84. \$ 0.50.

This book contains full scientific apparatus for the study of the Assyrian Code which was given in translation and introduction by Ehelolf and Koschaker in *Ein altassyrisches Rechtsbuch*. After some introductory remarks about the publication of the text by Schroeder in 1920, and a description of the text, Koschaker takes up the importance of the Code from a legal point of view. He then describes the technique of the laws, their contents, and their similarity to the Hammurabi laws. Then follows a discussion of some of the more important of the new laws, in which it is seen that they are composite, and contain many glosses, or later additions. This is the most valuable part of Koschaker's work, and will give rise to much speculation as to the origin of these glosses. After a series of paragraphs on special topics, such as the question of the levirate, etc., the writer gives an excellent outline of the Code, and an able discussion of its probable sources. No student of Semitic law can be without this fine piece of work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Ein altassyrisches Rechtsbuch. Übersetzt von Hans Ehelolf mit einer rechtsgeschichtlichen Einleitung von Paul Koschaker. Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1922, pp. 45.

This monograph makes the first part of a series of studies, edited by Otto Weber, and published by the Vorderasiatischen Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, which will treat in a semi-popular fashion some of the archaeological and literary monuments preserved in the Berlin Museum. This book gives a German translation of the new Assyrian Code, rendered into English by Jastrow and into French by Scheil. The translation is

well made, and is accompanied by numerous critical notes. Koschaker has contributed a very valuable Introduction in which he discusses the nature and contents of the Code, and throws welcome light upon many difficult problems of interpretation. He contrasts the structure of this Code with the Hammurabi Code, showing that the Assyrian Code is largely a compilation of earlier laws, and the laws in this Code are more discursive than those in the older Code. The work both of translator and commentator is well done.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Hethitische Gesetze. Von J. Friedrich und H. Zimmern. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922, pp. 32. \$ —.12.

This forms the 2. Heft of the 23. Jahrgang of *Der Alte Orient*, Professor Zimmern has herein presented us with an excellent translation of the Hittite Code as found at Boghazköi, and dating from about 1300 B.C. This translation is a most important contribution to the study of ancient law, especially as it is made at a time when fresh interest is aroused in this particular field of research by the recent publication and translation of the Assyrian Code. Zimmern's translation leaves very little to be desired. This is preceded by a brief introduction referring to the possible relationship between these Hittite laws and those of the Hammurabi Code of the Assyrian Code and of the Old Testament. He also shows that these particular laws represent a period of reform among the Hittites. The translation, which is the first to be made in any language, is furnished with excellent notes.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Entwicklung der Himmelsgöttin Nut zu einer Totengottheit. By A. Rusch. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922, pp. 62. \$ —.41.

In this interesting study, the author seeks to show how the skygoddess, Nut, became a goddess of the dead. In chapter one, he assembles the pyramid texts that have to do with the goddess, Nut. Chapter two is devoted to a study of the meaning of these texts, and here he shows how the grave and coffin were

identified with Nut, and how the dead became a star-god. The following chapter shows the development of these ideas during the later periods. Chapter four records an exception, and chapter five discusses the relationship between Nut and other mortuary deities. The whole work has been excellently done, and much light has been thrown upon many hieroglyphic texts.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels. By Hugo Gressmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921, pp. XVIII + 408. \$ 3.—; bound \$ 3.90.

This is a second edition of Gressmann's great work. As the author says, it is almost entirely re-written, and has a wealth of folk-lore material illustrative of the text. The work extends, as before, from the time of Samuel to that of Hosea inclusive, but has, in addition, fifteen long critical and historical notes on such important subjects as: *Die Lade Yahves, Seher und Propheten, Der Ephod, Riesensagen, Das Bündel des Lebens, Das Totenorakel, Heilige Tänze, Die Blutrache*, etc. Of great importance is an appendix of fourteen pages of *Textkritische Anmerkungen*, and of first-class value is the fine index. Dr. Gressmann has placed all students of the Old Testament under a great debt of gratitude for this excellent commentary.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead in Antiquity. By L. B. Paton. New York: Macmillan Company, 1921, pp. 325.

Spiritism is in the air. It has been for the last few years. Professor Paton has realized this, and has thought it interesting and timely to present a study of similar psychical manifestations in antiquity. Paton is well known for his able work on the origins of Semitic religious thought. His scientific method is well known and approved. But, it seems to the present reviewer, that there is a wide gulf between what the author is pleased to call spiritism in antiquity and modern spiritism. For example, in describing the way in which, as the Egyptians believed, spirits of the dead occupied statues, just as gods occupied images, the author thinks

it probable, without the slightest shred of evidence, that spirits possessed in Egypt "all the powers of levitation and of control that they manifested elsewhere". This is all pure imagination. Again, when he says that "spirits of the dead" in Egypt, "controlled mediums", he is simply romancing. The book is packed full of such unfounded assumptions. Then there are many matters of fact which are contradicted by what the author has to say. For example, he speaks of the cult of living kings in Babylonia as being an imitation of the Egyptian model. Now, assuming that Babylonian kings were worshipped during their life-time, which is not at all certain, there is still no proof that such was an imitation of Egyptian customs. Again, there is not a particle of evidence to show that ordinary mortals were ever worshipped in Egypt, even by their own descendants. He discusses the subject of prayer to the dead. He, accordingly, interprets wailing as such. According to such a method of interpretation, prayers to the dead, as divine beings, would be found among all peoples modern as well as ancient. Furthermore, in discussing spiritism in Babylonia he says that spirits of the dead were entirely maleficent. He confuses spirits of the dead with demons. He evidently takes the presence of *ilu* as a sign of deification. If that were so, we would be forced to conclude that Babylonians deified and worshipped bridges, canals, etc. An example of his method of forcing suitable meanings out of words is seen in the way in which he makes *Kigal* mean "Great Beneath". Now *ki* does not mean "beneath" at all. It simply means "place", "location".

It is with regret that the reviewer has been forced to record the above observations because he has always had the highest regard for the work and scholarship of Dr. Paton. Nor is this volume, in one respect, unworthy of Professor Paton. It is packed with interesting material, culled from numerous sources, on Chinese, Indo-European, Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Hebrew spiritism. But Paton started out with the will to show the *similarity* between spiritism in antiquity and modern spiritism and he has done so without much respect for what the ancient sources really teach.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Printed by W. Drugulin, Leipzig.

